

VOL. XXXI.—No. 2.—Whole No. 121.

Price, \$2.00 a Year.

THE  
American Church  
REVIEW.

MARCH AND APRIL, 1879.

NEW YORK:  
NO. 7 COOPER UNION.  
LONDON, TRÜBNER & CO.  
1879.

# THE AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW.

Rev. EDWARD B. BOGGS, D. D.,

Editor and Proprietor.

MARCH AND APRIL, 1879.

ART.	PAGE
I.—THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON THE ROMAN LAW.— Prof. Z. Hazzard Potter, M. D., Cornell University, (continued)	81
II.—HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN BOHEMIA AND MORAVIA.— Rev. John Anketell, Austin, Minn. (continued)	91
III.—THE "ROMAN METHOD" OF PRONOUNCING LATIN—A MIS- CHIEVOUS MISTAKE.—Rev. N. E. Cornwall, D. D., N. Y.	102
IV.—SOME LETTERS OF ST. BASIL, No. IV.—Rev. John H. Egar, D.D., Nashotah, Wis.	118
V.—PAUPERISM AND ITS TREATMENT.—Rev. F. D. Hoskins, Elmira, N. Y.	130
VI.—EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.—SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT IN THE CHURCH— DOMESTIC MISSIONS—BISHOP-ELECT OF LOUISIANA—CONSECRATION OF BISHOP OF MONTREAL AND ELECTION OF METROPOLITAN—ENGLAND, RITUALISM AND THE BISHOPS—NEW BISHOP OF DURHAM.	146
VII.—AMONG THE BOOKS.—KINGSLEY'S SERMONS—SMITH'S CHURCH HISTORY—ENGLISH MEN OF LETTERS—FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY— TRENCH, ON WORDS, ETC.,	155

## STANDING NOTICES.

**THE AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW** is published on the first of January, March, May, July, September, November.

**TERMS.**—The subscription is \$2.00 per volume in advance, for all. No subscriptions received for less than one volume. If a receipt is desired a postal stamp must be sent.

**REMITTANCES.**—Subscriptions now due, should be sent by Check or P. O. Order, **CHANGE OF ADDRESS.**—Subscribers in changing their Post Office Address, will please give notice at this office, or we cannot be responsible for the loss of their numbers.

**DISCONTINUANCES.**—It is a standing rule of this Office to send the Review to those subscribers who do not give notice of discontinuance previous to the commencement of a new volume. And even when due notice is given, the Magazine will not be discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the Proprietor.

**COMMUNICATIONS.**—All communications should be addressed "EDITOR AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW, Newark, N. J. or 7 Cooper Union, New York City."

# AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW.

---

VOL. XXXI—MARCH AND APRIL, 1879.

---

## THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON THE ROMAN LAW.\*

PART SECOND—CHAPTER IX.

### *The Paternal Power.*

New doctrines address themselves, more especially, to the young. Sons have their attention fixed on the future, and are carried forward; while their fathers, more pre-occupied with the present, are inclined to resistance.

Nascent Christianity aroused the spirit of the young, and cast dismay among the defenders of existing institutions. The missionaries of the Church were accused of being the missionaries of disorder, of counselling children to revolt against their parents' and preceptors, and of exciting them

---

<sup>1</sup> See Hunter's *Rom. L.* p. 43. The Paternal Power was the prerogative of Roman citizens only, and could only be exercised by the head of a family over his legitimate children. D. 50, 16, 215. Where, however, the demands of the State intervened the paternal despotism was excluded. A son could be elected magistrate, but could not marry without his father's consent, D. 1, 6, 9. For the peculiar relations of the Paternal Power to the family, see a former chapter.

\*(Copyright Secured.)

to shake off the yoke, of a worn out generation, frivolous and ignorant of true well-being.<sup>1</sup>

That tendency of opinions was the source of profound domestic agitations. Fathers who had patiently borne the disobedience of their children, disinherited them without mercy on the very day when a fortunate conversion rendered them humble and submissive.<sup>2</sup> Mothers whose tender souls opened to the new doctrines, sought in vain to excuse those conversions, which they had, perhaps, encouraged; guilty themselves of Christianity, they were repudiated.<sup>3</sup> It was not permitted, even to the slave, who would not incur the anger of his master, to be affiliated to the formidable faction of the Christians, although Christianity counselled him both fidelity and respect.<sup>4</sup>

The family, therefore, found itself divided into two camps; on the one side was the father entrenched in the old prejudices, and armed with the paternal power which protected them; and on the other, the wife, the children, and the slaves, opposing a firm resignation to that authority.<sup>5</sup> Sometimes the father of the family yielded to

---

<sup>1</sup> See Origen against Celsus. lib. iii. § 55. "*Quod illi delirent, mente capti sint, et nihil vere bonum vel sciant vel possint facere præoccupati nugis inanibus.*" <sup>2</sup> Tertullian Apolog. § 3. <sup>3</sup> Id. § 3.

<sup>4</sup> The family held together by the *Patria Potestas*, is the nidus from which the entire law of persons has germinated. Maine *An. L.* p. 147. Gaius I. 55 and 125, Tomk. and Lemon's Ed. p. 61, 120 et seq. "The heir as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant though he be lord of all." Galatians iv. 1.

<sup>5</sup> The charges of the Pagans on the subject of those divisions are curious. Mark how Origen *contra Celsus*, lib. iii. 44, et seq.—combats the invectives of Celsus. Pergit Celsus, et quæ de Jesu doctrina dicuntur a paucis e christianorum numero non prudentioribus, ut ipse putat, sed rudioribus, ait præcepta esse nostrorum hominum; nemo accedat eruditus, nemo sapiens, nemo prudens. Hoc pacto, inquit apparet quod solos fatuos ignavos, stolidos, mancipia, mulierculas, pueros, captent et pellicant. I translate: "Celsus proceeds, and what is said concerning the Chris-



the force of example and numbers ; he often resisted them, and fathers were seen standing alone for polytheism, in the midst of children and grandchildren chanting in their ears hymns of the Saviour.<sup>1</sup>

---

tian doctrine by a few of the not more learned of the Christians, as he thinks, but of the more uncultivated, he declares to be the precepts of our people. Let no one come to us who has been instructed, no one who is sagacious, no one who is prudent. By this means he says, it is evident that they captivate and deceive only the foolish, the timid, slaves, women and boys." Origen responds. "How much injustice there is in that charge ! Who can fail to recognize the grandeur, and exalted character of the principles and precepts, as well as of the Jewish, as of the new religion ; the profound sagacity of Moses, Solomon and the Prophets, the wisdom and eloquence of the Christian Apostles, of St. Paul among others, who, very far from interdicting that wisdom, placed it in the first rank of celestial gifts, only excluding that false wisdom, that which seeing only perishable things, studying only material phenomena cannot raise itself to the source of all wisdom, to God ! *Far from being injurious to Christianity true science is its most powerful auxiliary.* Doubtless the Church addresses itself also to the ignorant and feeble but in order to render them better, for Jesus Christ came to call all men to follow him in the new way, the wise as well as the feeble in spirit, the great as well as the humble." Celsus continues his reproaches. *Videre licet inquit, et in privatis edibus lanifices, sutores, fullones, illiteratissimum quemque et rusticissimum coram senioribus et prudentioribus patribus familias, nihil audere proloqui. Ubi vero seorsum nacti fuerint pueros eorum, et mulierculas imperitas, mira quædam disserere. Non esse audiendos parentes ac præceptores, sed sibi credendum quod illi delirent et mente capti sint, et nihil verè bonum vel sciant, vel possint facere, præoccupati nugis inanibus. Ipsi vero soli rationem vivendi norint exactissime. Et pueros beato*

<sup>1</sup> See the curious letter of St. Jerome to Læta, Christian daughter of the pagan pontiff Albinus, for whose conversion St. Jerome is hopeful through the influence of his Christian children and grandchildren. *Ad Lætiam.* Gibbon speaks of that letter.

Through these internal dissensions, and in the midst of the greatest paternal severities, we perceive how much of their ferocity ancient manners had lost. In the fine weather of the republic, it was not alone by disinherisons, that the paternal power sought to make itself respected; more than one Roman, jealous of that power, avenged the abandonment of the national religion, by the same sword which Brutus used to punish his sons who remained faithful to the tyrant. In its long war against the democracy, the patriciate had learned by experience the importance of again finding that terrible sword. Cassius was seen arraigning his sons before his domestic tribunal and condemning them to death, because they had embraced the party of the Agrarian laws, and the Senator, Fulvius, inflicted the same penalty on a son, young, amiable, intelligent and cultivated, for taking sides with Catiline in behalf of the people.<sup>2</sup>

---

*fore si se audient, atque adeo, propter eos totam familiam c. lv.* We translate: "In private houses we behold workers in wool, fullers, and persons of the most unlearned and rustic character, afraid to utter a word in the presence of their elders, and more learned masters; but when they privately get control of the children and women as ignorant as themselves, they make the most wonderful statements to the effect that their parents and teachers ought not to be heeded, but that they should obey *them*; that the former are foolish and stupid, neither knowing how nor having the ability to do anything really good, being preoccupied with empty trifles; that *they* alone know how men ought to live, and that if children are obedient to them, they will be both happy themselves, and make their homes happy also." *Quod si interim videant aliquem accedentem e preceptoribus, prudentioribus, aut ipsum patrem, tunc hos, si timidores fuerint, perterriri; sin ferociore, auctores fieri pueris, ut habenas excutiant, ab murmurando quod in presentia*

<sup>1</sup> Adhibito propinquorum et amicorum consilio.—Valer. Max. lib. v, cviii, n. 2.—Gravina, with respect to the *Twelve Tables*. § 25.

<sup>2</sup> Valer. Max. n. 5. Sallust. *Catilin.* 39.

But, after the imperial revolution, the severe traditions of antiquity lost, every day, some of their ascendancy.<sup>1</sup> On the one hand, the right of life and death accorded badly with the new constitutional form which tended to centralize all powers in the hands of the Emperor; while on the other, gentler manners repelled with horror the exercise of an authority which could only raise itself to that degree of energy, by trampling under foot the tenderest feelings of nature. A movement, therefore analogous to that which was preparatory to the loss of the right of life and death with respect to slaves, operated still more powerfully on the sons of the family; history, however, cannot follow its progress exactly, nor are we certain as to the precise period when fathers were deprived of so

---

patris, præceptorumve nec valeant, nec possint quidquam boni proloqui, metu illorum stultiae sævitiaeque modis omnibus corruptorum, ac devolutorum ad fundum malitiæ, et monitores punientium. Sed si quid discere velint, debere eos relicto patre et præceptoribus, ire cum mulierculis et collusoribus pueris in conclave mulierum, aut officinam sutoriam fulloniamve, ut perfectionem adipiscantur, præceptis obsequendo. We translate: "Meanwhile, if they see any one of the instructors approaching, or one of the more prudent, or even the father, the more timid then become afraid, while those who are more venturesome, incite the children to throw off the *paternal power*, whispering that in the presence of father and instructors, they neither can nor will instruct them in any thing good, since they turn away with aversion from the foolishness and severity of such persons, as being altogether corrupt and far gone in wickedness, and such as would inflict punishment upon them. But if they wish to learn anything, they must leave their fathers and instructors and go with the women, and other playmates, to the departments of the women,

<sup>1</sup> *Ex horrida illa antiquitate ad præsentem usum, quædam Augustus flexerat.* We translate: "Augustus remodelled many of the rigorous customs of antiquity in conformity with the manners of his time."—Tacitus *Anna.* iv. cxvi.

formidable a jurisdiction.<sup>1</sup> For my part, I believe, that it perished definitely when Erixo, a Roman chevalier, of the time of Seneca, who had caused the death of his son in chastising him, was pursued in the Forum with blows of the stiletto.<sup>2</sup> When any power is the object of such fearful execration it no longer has any right to exist; the law estab-

---

or to the leather shop or fuller's shop, that they may attain to perfection, and such are the words by which they win them over." Origen then replies: "Let him point out to us some masters and philosophers, teaching a morality purer than our own, and we will not prevent the young from attending their schools; let him point out one woman whom we have diverted from marital obedience, from the observance of her duties the most sacred. Why, moreover, should not our assemblies be composed of all classes? Christianity addresses itself to everyone; to the most ignorant, in order to enlighten them, and to the wise and good to support and raise them to a higher state of perfection."

<sup>1</sup> Baldinus fixes that epoch at the time of Augustus—*leg. Romul.* l. xvii; Giphanius at the time of Constantine—*ad leg. ult., C. de patria potestas*; Binkershoëk, at the time of Trajan, Adrian and Antoninus—*de jure occid. liber. c. ii. et seq.* Consult also Noodt *de partus expositione*. It is certain that the laws passed under the last named Emperors speak of that right as being abolished, for law 3, of C. Just. *de patria potestas*—limited the paternal power to moderate chastisement, and that law was passed by Alexander Severus. Ulpian in law 2 of the Digest *ad leg. Cornel. de sicariis*, says that the father ought not to slay his son for any crime. Paul speaks of the right of life and death as abolished l. 11, Digest, *de liber. et posthumis*. See also the last law of the Digest, *si a parente fuis manumissus*, etc., and law 5. D. *de lege Pompeia de parricidiis*. Therefore, that right no longer existed at the time of Trajan and Alexander Severus. But I think that manners more than the laws, had done it justice even before the time of those Emperors. Consult Godefroy with respect to law 2. C. Theod. *de causa liber.* V. Gaius. Tomk. and Lem. ed. p. 61, 226 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> Seneca. *de Clementia* lib. I. c. xiv

lishing it becomes a dead letter; it has abdicated. It appears to me, then, that Alexander Severus only confirmed by statute, a question already settled by custom, when he reduced the rights of fathers to that of inflicting a few simple corrections.<sup>1</sup> As to the homicidal father, inasmuch as ideas were not yet settled,<sup>2</sup> Constantine rendered striking homage to the sentiments of nature by his constitution which punished with the penalties for parricide,<sup>3</sup> the father who slew his son in any manner whatever.<sup>4</sup>

It was during that enfeeblement of the paternal jurisdiction that Christianity insinuated itself into the family; that jurisdiction had lost its most important attribute, and no longer possessed any penalties capable of terrifying hearts disposed to set martyrdom<sup>5</sup> at defiance. The domestic tribunal was, therefore, a feeble barrier against the enthusiastic love of children for the new doctrines.

When Constantine ascended the throne, Christianity was far from having subdued all the ranks of social life. It still had a long journey before it, not only in the institutions, but in the genius of the people. That prince aimed to impart a more energetic enthusiasm to the religion which he protected, by changing the character, already modified,

<sup>1</sup> See Cujas lib. iv. observ. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Marcian. l. 5, D. *de lege Pompeia de parricid.*

<sup>3</sup> The parricide was sown up in a sack with a dog, cock, viper and ape, and thrown into the sea or into a river, that even in his life-time he might be deprived of the use of the elements, and that the air might be denied him while he lived and the earth when he died. Justin. Inst. iv, 18; is taken from the legislation of the XII Tables. The law *Pompeia de parricidiis* was passed in the Consulship of Pompeius, B. C. 52.

<sup>4</sup> Year 318. L. 1, C. Theod. *de parricid.* and L. unic. C. Just. *de his qui parent. vel liber.* That constitution was addressed especially to Africa, where infants were offered to Saturn, and where they were often slain and exposed. Godefroy.

See what these penalties were. L. 3, C. Just. *de patria potest.*



of the paternal power; for, says Montesquieu, in order to extend a new religion it is necessary to relieve the extreme dependence of the children, who always cling least tenaciously to that already established.<sup>1</sup>

Sometimes in a revolution which is brought about in the bosom of society, the question is not to overthrow blindly, but to ameliorate by prudent measures. Accordingly, the father was still recognized and respected as chief of all his descendants; he was not deprived of the right to inflict moderate punishment, and in most momentous cases could even lay his complaint before the magistrate and suggest to him the severe sentence which domestic discipline demanded; and finally, disinheritance remained intact in his hands. But those measures which had not impeded the progress of ideas under a hostile power were still less formidable under a strong protector. The question to which Constantine directed his attention was that of the *peculium*. He desired by such means to render the position of children more independent.

We know that originally the son as well as his entire estate<sup>2</sup> belonged to the father. But in consequence of that equitable tendency which the epoch of the Empire infused

<sup>1</sup> *Esprit des lois*, liv. xxiii, ch. xxi.

<sup>2</sup> L. 3, C. Just., *de patria potest.*

<sup>3</sup> Ulp. l. 195, §2. D. *de verb. signif.* Gaius. Inst. ii, 87, 106. The term *Peculium* may be traced to *peculia*, and thence to *pecus*, since the wealth of ancient Italy consisted mainly in herds of cattle, the soil belonging to the State. The term *peculium* was applied to whatever was allotted to the son of the family or slave for his personal use, for which he could be called upon to account at any moment. It was not as Dr. Maine observes, a "qualified and dependent ownership," but an estate of which the son or slave had only the use. The word is thus defined by Tubero. *Quod servus domini permissu separatim a rationibus dominicis habet, deducto inde si quid domino debetur.* L. 5, sec. 4 Dig. *de pec.* See Gaius, II, 106. Tomk. & Lemon's Ed. p. 306.

into all minds, Augustus, Nerva and Trajan had bestowed upon the son of the family, the personal estate, acquired by him during military service; *peculium castrense*.<sup>1</sup> At first that innovation was cautiously introduced. If the son died without having disposed of his military estate, it was regarded as having always belonged to the father by virtue of his Paternal Power<sup>2</sup>; moreover, the son could dispose of it only during the period of his military service. But Adrian granted the disposal of it to the son of the family who had retired from the service.

Such was the state of things when Constantine, by a Constitution of 321, assimilated to the military estate the property acquired by the son of the family in the offices of the palace of the prince.<sup>3</sup> That idea was considered ingenious by his successors, and under the title of *quasi-castrensi*, the military property was increased by that acquired by sons, as assessors,<sup>4</sup> advocates,<sup>5</sup> officers attached to the Prefect of the Pretorium,<sup>6</sup> as bishops, deacons and ecclesiasties<sup>7</sup>; in fine, as public functionaries.<sup>8</sup> Moreover after Justinian, the *castrensi* and *quasi-castrensi* property of deceased intestate sons no longer went to the father by right of the paternal power. The father was only an heir who took rank in his turn, and when the law named him as such.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Paul. *Sent.* iii, 4 §3. Ulp. l. 2. D. ad. S. C. Macedon., and Fragm. tit. xx §10, Inst. *quibus non est permissum*. Juv. Sat. xvi, 51. The *peculium castrense* was an estate created during the wars which preceded the establishment of the Empire; when special inducements were held out to those in the military service.

<sup>2</sup>Tryph. l. 19 §3, D. *de cast. pec.* Maecian., l. 18, §1 and 2, same title. Ulp. l. v. D., same title. Diocl. l. 5, C. Inst.

<sup>3</sup>L. 1, C. *de cast. omn. palat.* <sup>4</sup>L. 7, C. *de assessorib.* year 422, Honor. and Theod. <sup>5</sup>L. 4, C. *de advocat.* year 424, the same emperors. <sup>6</sup>L. 4, C. *de cast. pecul.* Theod. and Valent. <sup>7</sup>L. 34, C. *de episcop.* Leo. et Anthem. <sup>8</sup>L. 34, C. *de inoff. test.* Just. Godefroy on l. 3, C. Theod. *de postuland.* Puchta's Instit. Vol. III, p. 149, seq.

<sup>9</sup>Vinnius, on the Institutes, *quib. non est permissum* n. 4.

But that was not all; the estate of the mother which had hitherto descended to the father was given by Justinian to the son in power, reserving to the father the use thereof during life; if, however, the father happened to marry again the use was his only during the minority of his son.<sup>1</sup> In case he emancipated his son after the opening of the maternal succession, he received as a recompense for that benefit, not only the life estate, but one-third of the property<sup>2</sup> in fee.

These were important innovations, and it is evident that they effected striking improvements in behalf of children; the consciousness of their civil importance had made its appearance in a system which had hitherto enslaved them.

But legislation did not stop here. Constantine had only reached the maternal estate; the successions of uncles fell, therefore, by the ancient law into the hands of the father.<sup>3</sup> Gratian and Valentinian the Younger assimilated them to the succession of the mother,<sup>4</sup> and that enlargement of the rights of the son of the family was confirmed by Honorius<sup>5</sup> and Arcadius.<sup>6</sup>

The improvements continued under Valentinian III, who deprived the father of his estate in property acquired by his children in power by their marriage.<sup>7</sup>

Nevertheless, as to other adventitious property, the ancient law was always maintained. The son still lingered under its bondage, and was deprived of the right to sell, to mortgage, or to dispose of his estate by testament; there was a want of unity in his condition; it seemed that there were in him two distinct persons, the one bowed down under the yoke of the severest dependence, and the other initiated to the prerogatives of liberty. Such contrasts are necessarily

<sup>1</sup> L. 1, 2, 3, C. Theod. de maternis bonis, and the notes of Godefroy. <sup>2</sup>L. 2, C. Theod. *loc. cit.* See also C. Just. *de bonis maternis*.

<sup>3</sup> L. 1 and 2, C. Theod. *loc. cit.* <sup>4</sup> L. 5, 6, Theod. *loc. cit.* <sup>5</sup> L. 6, C. Theod. *loc. cit.* <sup>6</sup> L. 7, C. Theod. *loc. cit.* <sup>7</sup> L. 8, C. Theod. *loc. cit.* <sup>8</sup> L. unic. C. Theod. de bonis quæ filiis familias ex matrem.

obliterated by time, but are inevitable in all legislation, composed of successive elements juxtaposed according to diverse systems. Justinian, generalizing the idea of Constantine, gave to the son the property in everything without distinction, which formed a part of his adventitious estate; the father no longer had more than the usufruct, and in case of emancipation, the usufruct of one-half only, and that prince congratulated himself in the name of humanity for these reforms.<sup>1</sup> But what had led him to comprehend the voice of humanity if it were not Christianity, the source of all clemency and liberal advancement? "Christiana disciplina paulatim patriæ potestatis duritiem emoliente."

Z. HAZARD POTTER

(TO BE CONTINUED).

---

## THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN BOHEMIA AND MORAVIA.

Before the storm of war burst upon unhappy Bohemia, destroying almost every vestige of evangelical religion in it, and substituting for it the government of Jesuits, a great Synod of the Brethren was held in April, 1616, at Zerawitz, a place on the frontiers of Moravia and Hungary. There were present church officers of every rank under the presidency of Archbishop John Lanek. The great work of this Synod was its setting forth of a document, entitled, *Ratio disciplinæ ordinisq; ecclesiastici in unitate fratrum Bohemiorum*. It sets forth fully the doctrine, discipline and worship of the *Unitas Fratrum*, as then existing, and was adopted one hundred and eleven years later (1727) at Herrnhut by the renewed church as their standard. So that it forms a connecting link, uniting the

---

<sup>1</sup> Inst. per quas personas.

<sup>2</sup> Id. and L. 6, C. de bonis quæ liberis.

Church of Michael Bradaty with that of Count Zinzendorf.

Matters were rapidly approaching a crisis in Bohemia. The compact between the Catholic and Protestant parties proved to be only a hollow truce. The Emperor and his friends declared without concealment, that they would embrace the first convenient opportunity which offered itself to them, to withdraw the privileges which had been unwillingly wrung from them. It was even said that the *Majestätsbrief* was *ipso facto* null and void, because it had been granted without the consent of the Pope, who openly protested against it. On the other hand the evangelical *Defensors* were continually claiming more than had been granted to them, and were doing all that they could to provoke and irritate their Romish adversaries. The attitude of all, and especially of *King Ferdinand*, left no hope for a peaceful solution of the difficulty. Ferdinand had been educated by the Jesuits, and was through his entire life their slave and tool. "From this fact," says the R. C. historian, "arose his great intolerance and hatred of everything, which was not Roman Catholic." When he was but a youth of twenty, he knelt before the image of Mary at Loretto, and registered a solemn vow, that he would drive all heretics with their teachers, out of Steiermark, Carinthia and Krain, even at the expense of his life. This vow he renewed twenty years later as King of Bohemia and Hungary. He is reported to have said, that sooner than to suffer a heretic to remain in his service, or, even in his dominions, he would rather take a stick in his hand and go about from door to door, with his wife and children, begging his bread. When Rudolf granted toleration to Bohemia, Ferdinand refused a similar petition in Steiermark with the strongest terms of disapprobation. It is said, that at his coronation in Bohemia, when he swore to uphold the edict of toleration, he had just before sworn privately in the sacristy, that he would never grant anything to heretics, which could be injurious to the Catholic Church! Certainly he was consistent in one trait of char-



acter—"he kept no faith with heretics." It must also be borne in mind, that he was not the son of the Emperor Matthias, and possessed no hereditary right to the crown of Bohemia. This fact greatly weakened the allegiance of Protestant Bohemians to his authority, and prepared the way for the coming commotions. At his coronation in Moravia the Jesuits prepared a triumphal arch, in which they represented the Austrian arms in the centre, on either side the Moravian eagle and the Bohemian lion *chained*, and underneath a hare sleeping with open eyes, with the inscription: "*This is my way!*" On his return Ferdinand formed a privy council of ten members, of whom only three were evangelicals. A censorship was established over the press, so that nothing could be printed against the Roman Church, while its opponents were reviled and calumniated in every possible way. Still another step was taken against the Brethren. On the death of Bishop Matthias Cyrus an attempt was made to rob them of the Bethlehem Church; but the Consistorium defeated the plan. The fortress of Kalstein was taken away from Count Matthias Thurn, because he had opposed the choice of Ferdinand, and was given to Martinitz. The new possessor immediately forbade the administration of Protestant baptisms and burials.

The Protestant churches at Klostergrab and in Brannau were seized by violence, and the former was torn down. On the other hand, many of the Protestant preachers did all they could to inflame the minds of their hearers by furious harangues and reproaches against the Jesuits. Neither side sought the things which make for peace, and who can wonder that war was the result? To add to the difficulty of the situation bitter quarrels prevailed within the Protestant ranks; Lutheran and Calvinist being arrayed against each other in ceaseless feud. The estates of Bohemia at that time possessed (as even Catholic historians admit), greater privileges than the English parliament under James I, who was then on the throne of England. Among those estates were the Protestant leaders, who had

long contended for their religion, till at length they wrung from an unwilling monarch the *Majestätsbrief*. They called the Emperor to account for the outrages at Klostergrab and Brannau. The Emperor replied that he would consider the coming together of the Defensors an act of treason; since he alone was the Defensor of the empire. This answer was received with great indignation by the Estates. Count Thurn did all he could to increase the excitement. He represented to them that the Emperor's insolent reply had been drawn up by his counsellors at Prag, and only signed at Vienna.

On the eventful morning of the 23d of May, 1618, the Protestant deputies of the Estates, armed and with numerous followers, appeared at the royal palace, and burst with violence into the council chamber where were sitting Lobkowitz, Martinitz, Slawata and Sternberg. With threatening tones they demanded of each, whether he had taken part in the imperial message, or given his assent thereto. Sternberg gave a civil answer, but Martinitz and Slawata were insolent. Then cried Wenzel von Roupow (a member of the *Unitas*), "Out of the window with them, according to old Bohemian custom!" For Bohemia had a disagreeable way of flinging obnoxious persons out of the window. Lobkowitz and Sternberg were taken by the arm and conducted out of the chamber; while Martinitz and Slawata pleaded to be dealt with legally. But their opponents were too much embittered now to listen to any such pleadings. Several seized Martinitz, crying, "Holy Virgin, save me!" dragged him to the window, and flung him into the court-yard below. "See if your Virgin can save you!" cried Thurn sneeringly, as Martinitz shot through the casement. "By G——, she *has* saved him!" was his next exclamation, as he looked down in astonishment. The Romish counsellor had fallen sixty feet, lit upon a dung-heap, and escaped unhurt. All stood speechless with surprise. Then cried Thurn: "Noblemen, here is the other!" Out went Slawata and was badly, but not danger-

ously, bruised. Meanwhile the Secretary Fabricius had hidden himself. "He ran to a cupboard, and shutted himself up in it," as the guide of the present day quaintly describes the scene. But his retreat was discovered and he also was flung out. He fell on Slawata, escaped unhurt, and had presence of mind enough to *apologize* for falling on his superior!

This event has always been regarded as the initial act of the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648). Fabricius hastened with the tidings to the Emperor at Vienna. All Rome regarded the escape of these high and lofty tumblers as a manifest miracle, and they themselves made votive offerings for their escape at the shrine of Mary in Loretto. Slawata was compelled to sign a declaration that he would take no vengeance for the deed.

This act of revolt was followed by other violent measures. Thirty Defensors were nominated to conduct affairs. The Estates seized all the government offices in Bohemia, pretending to administer them in the name of the king. The Jesuits, regarded as the authors of the previous oppression, were, under the title of the "*hypocritical sect*," banished from the entire kingdom. The Archbishop of Prag, the Abbots of Strahof and Brannau, with other Roman ecclesiastics were also banished, and forbidden to return under pain of death. The Capuchins and other monks were not displeased at the downfall of the Jesuits. It is said that some, disguised as coal miners, remained concealed in Prag. The Protestants maintained that they only intended to preserve intact the royal authority and the laws of the realm; but deeds of violence frequently occurred. In November, 1618, the Catholic Mayor of Aussig was most cruelly murdered by twenty-four Protestant citizens, who had conspired against him. They killed him in the market-place, piercing his body with more than two hundred wounds.

In Moravia the Catholic dean of Holeschau, in February, 1620, was tortured by the Reformed in a horrible manner to wring from him confessions damaging to his master, the

Lord von Lobkowitz. After suffering intolerable pangs in prison for four weeks, death came to his relief. Such acts did not reflect glory on the Protestant cause; though, as we shall see, they were punished with a ten-fold retaliation. The expulsion of the Jesuits aroused great hatred in the hearts of the Catholic princes against Protestant Bohemia. Ferdinand, their willing tool, was especially indignant. At first he appeared inclined to conciliatory measures, and even Cardinal Klesel of Vienna counselled moderation. But the Bohemians persisted in their course. From Moravia came warning voices, urging peace. Carl von Zerotin pleaded with the Estates at Prag, but in vain. The Bohemians hoped for assistance from the neighboring countries, Silesia, Moravia, the Lawsitz (Lusatia) and Hungary; and sent urgent messages to them.

At length the aged Emperor resolved on war-like measures, and Ferdinand, who had talked of conciliation, disclosed the real sentiments of his heart, in his well-known utterance: "We would rather have a wasted than a damned kingdom!" An imperial army entered Bohemia, bringing with them a conciliatory proclamation from the Emperor, to the effect that he respected the *Majestätsbrief*, and only raised the army to defend his own rights. But the leaders of the revolt concealed this from the people, and thereby hastened their own doom.

All Bohemia, except three towns, Budweis, Krumau and Pilsen, took part in the insurrection. The cruelties of the imperial soldiery increased the rage of the people. Thurn hoped by terror to gain possession of Budweis and Krumau, the latter surrendered, but Budweis held out gallantly for the Emperor. Thurn, Count Schlik, and the heroic Count Ernst von Mansfeld led the parliamentary army. The situation was very similar to that of England under Charles I. The terror spread even into adjacent countries, such as Upper Lusatia. With the winter negotiations commenced, Saxony, Bavaria and Mainz offered their mediations. King Sigmund of Poland threatened to take up arms against the

Bohemians. A day in April, 1619, was fixed for the Emperor and the Elector of Saxony to meet the rebel leaders at Eger and treat with them. In Bohemia opinions were divided. Budowa, Schlik and others desired a compromise, Thurn and his comrades wished for nothing but open war. But in the midst of this angry commotion the aged Emperor died on the 20th of March. This broke up the conference. Ferdinand, as lawful king of Bohemia, made conciliatory proposals to the diet. But the Estates had gone too far for compromise. They maintained that Ferdinand had been elected king in a fraudulent way, and that as he was not the son of Matthias, he had no natural claim to the succession. It was maintained that a secret treaty existed to convert Bohemia into a Spanish-Austrian province, and to suppress by force the religion, which had been bravely fought for during two centuries. In the fear of what Ferdinand might do, they made a league against him, and Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia and Lusatia united for the maintenance of their religious freedom.

Mansfeld had taken Pilsen, but otherwise was not successful in his conflict with the imperial troops. Thurn went to Moravia and excited insurrection there. The noblemen, who remained faithful to the Archduke, were imprisoned, and among them Carl von Zerotin. By a rapid march Thurn reached Vienna, a majority of whose citizens then were Protestants. Ferdinand expected every moment the triumph of his enemies. The Bohemian cannon balls entered the city, and sixteen Austrian nobles forced their way into Ferdinand's chamber, to compel him to sign a treaty with the Bohemians. One of them seized him by the buttons of his coat and shouted in his ear: "Ferdinand; wilt thou sign?" At that moment the blast of a trumpet rang through the city, and the threatening noblemen disappeared. A regiment of cuirassiers had come to the relief of the Archduke, and were soon followed by other troops. At the same time news came that Mansfeld had been beaten by the imperial army in Bohemia, and was



retreating on Prag. Thurn hastened to its relief, and Vienna was delivered. Ferdinand set out immediately for Frankfort-am-Main, and was there, in spite of the protests of Bohemian deputies, chosen Emperor of Germany. The Bohemians, in surprise and terror at this untoward event, resolved immediately on the choice of another king. After much discussion the crown was tendered to the Elector Friedrich V., of the Palatinate (Pfalz), who was at that time the head of the Protestant league against the Roman power. A more unfortunate choice could scarcely have been made. Friedrich was a Reformer (or strict Calvinist), and this displeased the Lutherans. He had a pleasing address and good heart, but was a man of no decision of character, and unfitted to lead in the hour of peril. The splendor of a royal crown, offered him by a free nation, which summoned him to defend its religion and its liberties, dazzled him; his court preacher assured him that it was a manifest call of God; and his aspiring spouse, Elizabeth, daughter of James I. of England, would give him no rest, until he accepted. "Couldst thou venture," she said, "to take the hand of a king's daughter, and yet shrink from a crown which is freely offered to thee? I would rather eat bread at thy royal table than to feast at thine electoral board!"

Moved by such arguments as these, Friedrich accepted the proffered honor, and his coronation was so splendid and joyous that few thought of the approaching peril. There is still extant an old Bohemian song of the Thirty Years' War, which tells of the brief glory of Friedrich and his sad and sudden downfall. One verse may be rendered thus :—

O Budeweis (Budowa), thy luckless fate  
Hath brought us to this wretched state,  
That we must perish miserably!  
And so we all cry out on thee!  
Thy aims were far too proud and high,  
And hope made blind thine eagle eye!

Friedrich's affability, contrasted with Rudolf's grim

visage, won the former many friends. But his triumph was short-lived. Ferdinand obtained the support of all the Catholic princes in Germany, and Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, put himself at the head of an army, which should win Bohemia again for the Emperor. Friedrich, on the other hand, entered into alliance with the prince of Siebenbürgen, who, together with the Turks, was raging war against Austria, and this unholy alliance gave just offence to Germany. As Reformed, he was displeasing to the Lutheran Elector of Saxony, who had hoped to obtain the Bohemian crown for himself. Even in Bohemia and Moravia hostility arose against Friedrich, since, influenced by his wife and his Calvinistic ministers he had introduced many changes in public worship. The Roman clergy were driven from their places and relentlessly persecuted, the pictures in the venerable cathedral were torn down and treated with contempt, even the crucifix itself was hurled to the ground and trampled under foot. Very similar to this was the conduct of the English Puritans and the Dutch in Japan, who were accustomed to trample upon the cross to please the pagans! A picture of Christ of remarkable beauty was with difficulty saved from destruction. Even the Utraquists themselves shed tears over the desecration of their beautiful Dom.

An ancient record gives this account of a "communion" (!) service in the renovated cathedral. "After the temple had been cleansed, on Christmas Eve they placed a table in the middle of the choir with twelve chairs around it, and held their communion in the following fashion. The king himself took the bread and broke it, another put the pieces on a plate, then each helped himself to a piece and ate it, and then took a drink of the wine. A great multitude of the Bohemian people, both Hussites and Lutherans, had assembled to witness this communion service. With great astonishment and not without pain, they beheld the performance and openly said, that they had never seen

the Lord's Supper so celebrated before, and could scarcely believe that it would be salutary to the soul."

The Estates gave urgent advice to the king not to persecute the Roman clergy, but the counsels of his English wife and his court preacher Schulz prevailed with him. Wilhelm von Lobkowitz was most strenuous in his advice to the king not to permit the horrible sacrilege of his ministers. At the same time Friedrich's personal affability won him many friends.

In February, 1620, about the end of the winter that Friedrich reigned (which gave him the nickname of Winterkönig, "the winter-king"), he went to Moravia to receive the homage of that kingdom. Carl von Zerotin held himself aloof from the king, who attempted there also to change religious worship. Friedrich missed him in an assembly of Moravian nobles to which he had been invited, had him brought in by force, took him aside to a window, and strove with flattering words to win his allegiance from the Emperor. The Baron remained steadfast, and prophesied misfortune to the king. For this he was thrown into prison and alternately cajoled with promises and threatened with exile and death. But nothing could shake the fidelity of Zerotin. "Willingly," he said, "will I give both fortune and life, to escape the shame of perjury and treason against my Emperor, which would rest on my memory and my family." His sufferings lasted about as long as Friedrich's prosperity.

Already, on the 23d of January, the Winter-king had been placed under the ban of the Empire. While he was estranging many hearts from him by his ecclesiastical innovations, he was at the same time squandering the resources of his land in useless luxury and ill-timed generosity. The disappointment of the Bohemian nobles chilled their zeal in his cause, and the lack of all foreign aid weakened their confidence. In the autumn, Duke Maximilian of Bavaria burst into Bohemia with the army of the Catholic league, both imperial and Spanish troops. At the same time the Lutheran Elector of Saxony assailed the Lausitz,

and Polish troops invaded Silesia, and all met with success. The Bohemian army, destitute of necessary supplies, and with leaders quarreling among themselves, lost courage and hope, and became more dangerous to the defenceless peasantry than to their armed and formidable foes. In vain did Friedrich appear in their camp to inspire the soldiery with his presence, and to stimulate the nobility by his example.

At the beginning of November the terrible Tilly was at the gates of Prag. On the *Weiss-berg* (white-hill), not far from the city, the Bohemians encountered the Imperial and Bavarian armies on the ill-fated 8th of November. It was the 23d Sunday after Trinity, and an eloquent Carmelite monk, stimulated the zeal of the Catholic warriors by a text from the Gospel for the day: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's." Friedrich expected no attack that day, for, after listening to a sermon from his court preacher, he had given a banquet, and sat at table with the English ambassador. At the beginning of the battle the cavalry of the Prince of Anhalt won some advantage for Friedrich, but the overwhelming force of the enemy soon destroyed it. The invincible Bavarians and Walloons pressed on, and the Hungarian cavalry were the first to turn their backs in flight.

JOHN ANKETELL.

## THE "ROMAN METHOD" OF PRONOUNCING LATIN A MISCHIEVOUS MISTAKE.

Some Latin Grammars, recently prepared for American students, set forth two very different and wholly irreconcilable methods of pronouncing some of the consonants which occur most frequently in Latin words. The inevitable result of the pronunciation of Latin by methods so diverse must be an irrepressible conflict, involving practical questions which bear directly upon some of the most important aims of sound and useful education. In comparison with such questions, very trifling is the slight diversity in the sounds of two or three of the vowels, and two or three of the consonants, according to the old pronunciation of Latin by English and American scholars, on the one hand, and by the Continental scholars of Europe, on the other. The peculiar sounds of two or three vowels, in which the English and American scholars differed from the Continental, involved no question of practical importance. Nor was any serious difficulty caused by the peculiar sound of two or three consonants, in which the Continental scholars of the several nations so differed from each other as to make the very phrase, "the Continental method," always a *misnomer*. But the introduction of the "Roman method," so called, and very strangely regarded by some as almost identical with the misnamed "Continental Method," changes the whole aspect of the question of Latin pronunciation.

It used to be said that European scholars of the Continent could hardly understand the Latin words spoken by American and English scholars on occasions of literary entertainment and intellectual intercourse. The Continental



scholars always pronounced Latin with those sounds of the vowels *a*, *e* and *i*, which are heard in the speech of Italians, Frenchmen and Spaniards; and in the English words, *father*, *obey* and *machinist*. And in general, until recently, English and American scholars gave to those vowels in Latin the sounds which they have in the English words *fate*, *me* and *mine*.

But the truth is that, in a large majority of Latin syllables, the plainest rules of prosody and the uniform usage of ancient poets make those vowels short, as in the English words *fat*, *met* and *pit*. And the difficulty experienced by the Continental scholars, in understanding the Latin spoken by Americans and Englishmen, was increased by the common neglect of those plainest rules of prosody, among the French, Italian and German, as well as the English and American scholars. For all erroneously made the vowels long in many short syllables of Latin words. If that common fault had been corrected, on all sides, the difficulty of understanding each other might have been remedied, long ago, for all scholars who would duly regard Latin quantity in their pronunciation. It might have been much relieved without any change of the sounds of the vowels *a*, *e* and *i*, in the comparatively few syllables in which those vowels have their long sound. But of late, through increased acquaintance with the French, Spanish and Italian languages, as well as the German, the long sounds of the vowels *a*, *e* and *i*, heard in those languages, have been extensively adopted by English and American scholars. And frequently, also, an erroneous use of the long sounds of the vowels, in syllables which, by the rules of Latin quantity are short, shows itself in a faulty imitation of the French and German sounds of some vowels which are amusingly exaggerated and made excessively long by many English and American students, who ought to have learned, for themselves, from the prosody of any Latin grammar, to avoid such an error. In some quarters this error has become so prevalent as to render the change in some of the vowel sounds, which has

been generally adopted, a movement of almost questionable utility. For example: many students who profess to have been prepared for the college or university by teachers of high reputation, in very popular schools, pronounce the Latin word *murmur*, *moor-moor*; although the second syllable of that word in Latin is, by the rules of prosody and by the usage of ancient poets, as strictly short as it is in English. The same error is hardly less palpable and equally culpable, in a similar lengthening of the *u*, in the last syllable of other words ending in *ur*; which, by the rules of prosody, is invariably short. In fact, the *u* in the first syllable of the Latin word *murmur* must have, in any fluent pronunciation, a short sound, although that syllable, ending in two consonants, not a mute and a liquid, is long. The same is true of other vowels in syllables thus made long by two consonants. To give any vowel, except *o*, in such syllables, the long sound, would make the syllables too long, and betray intolerable pedantry or affectation. For it is plain, from the frequent abbreviations of words and elisions of syllables in the Latin comedies, and from the universal abhorrence of any, the least *hiatus*, in pronunciation, among the ancient Romans as well as the Greeks, that the Latin, as a living language, was a fluent speech, and though spoken less "trippingly on the tongue" than the English, it would yet never have tolerated such a drawling utterance as *moor-moor* for *murmur*, or anything of that sort.

But now a very sweeping change in the sounds of the consonants, *c* and *g*, which has been proposed and strenuously advocated by some English and American scholars, tends, in proportion to its influence, to make "confusion worse confounded," in any international colloquy of Latin words. In the very face of immemorial usage, in all the languages directly descended from the Latin, such scholars hold that the letters *c* and *g*, in Latin words, should have, before all vowels, without exception, the hard sound heard in the English words *cat* and *got*. And this notion is

maintained by them chiefly through a misconstruction, and a mistranslation of a certain passage in the Institutes of Quintilian, in which he gives his own views and those of other Latins of his time, concerning the letter *k*. (Lib. I, c. 7). The language of Quintilian, very strictly translated, is this :

For I indeed think that *k* is to be used in no words, except those which it denotes, even when it is placed alone. This, [point] therefore, I have not omitted, because some think that letter necessary, as often as *a* follows ; although there is the letter *c*, which imparts its own force to all vowels. But orthography also is subservient to custom, and therefore has been often changed.

Now, it is not easy to imagine how any could gather from all this, that the letter *c*, in Latin, was identical with *k*, which, in Quintilian's view, had become almost obsolete. For he says distinctly that some thought *k* still necessary before *a* ; as if *c* had, in some positions, a peculiar sound, which could not be given to it before *a*, without a mispronunciation of some words. Quintilian does not say that the letter *c* has only one sound, but that it imparts its own force, "*vim suam*," to all vowels. This does not at all imply that the letter *c* had not then, in Latin, a two-fold force, as it has always had in the languages directly descended from the Latin ; the Italian, the Spanish and the French, as well as in the English. German scholars, also, pronounce *Cicero*, *Tsitsero*, and give the letter *c* the sound of *ts* in many other words from foreign sources. And Quintilian himself had already presented in his Institutes (Lib. I, c. 5), a view of the aspirated sound of *c*, before *o*, as well as *e* and *i*, which plainly shows that *c* was not so strictly identical with *k*, as to be used, in all places, before *a*, without some risk of mispronunciation. His language is this : "For a short time an excessive use [of the aspirate] broke out, so that *choronæ chenturiones*, *præhones*, remain as yet in some inscriptions ; and concerning this fact there is a well known epigram of Catullus." One of the words mentioned by Catullus, in the epigram on Arrius, to which

Quintilian refers, is the word *commoda*, which Arrius pronounced with an aspirated *c*, and thought it admirable. To show him off, Catullus represented him as saying *chommoda*, instead of *commoda*. It is not possible, at this late day, to say precisely how Arrius pronounced the aspirated *c*, which Catullus represented by *ch*. But this testimony of Catullus, added to that of Quintilian, establishes beyond dispute these two points: that during the period from Catullus to Quintilian the letter *c*, in Latin words, was not restricted to the sound of *k*, and that *ch* had not the sound of *k*, but represented another sound, whatever it may have been, which some speakers gave to the letter *c*, in various positions, as well before *o* as before *e*.

Here, then, is clear, full proof that *c* was not identical with *k* before Quintilian's time. And yet a late writer jumps to that strange conclusion, through a palpable misconception of the other passage in which Quintilian speaks of the letters *c* and *k*. (*Lib. I. c. 7*). That passage Professor Blair, "on the pronunciation of Latin," gives, in the Latin of Quintilian, and then perverts it by a one-sided paraphrase, which has no affinity to the truth of a strict translation. But since that paraphrase stands within marks of quotation, and Professor Blair takes a conservative view of the sounds of *j* and *v*, as Latin letters, it is due to candor to suppose, that as to *c* and *k*, he may have been misled by some bold conceit and rash comment of another. Still he unjustly ascribes to Quintilian "the declaration that *c*, in the classical age, was *k* everywhere." He also asserts expressly that Quintilian said, "the sound of *k* was the sound of *c*," when, in fact, Quintilian says no such thing. All that he says upon this point is, that the letter *c* "imparts its own force to all vowels." He does not say what its own force was; and candidly admits that some thought it could not be used instead of *k* in all words. The plain truth, then, by Quintilian's own showing, is that the letter *c* had more than one sound, in his time. Otherwise, none could have thought that *k* was still necessary

before *a*. Those who thought so were grammarians who held, in mere theory, as some do in these days, that no letter should have more than one sound, insisting on a visionary idea, which has never yet been realized in any language; a vain idea, which, from the very nature of all languages, can never be realized in any.

It is a fact very strangely overlooked by many Englishmen and Americans that, in other modern languages, as well as the English, some letters have more than one sound. In this respect, the peculiarity of the English language is that it gives a greater variety of sounds to some letters than they have in other languages, and allows a greater diversity of sounds to certain combinations of letters in some words, according to their derivation from one or another language. Not only has the letter *c* more than one sound in the French, the Spanish and the Italian; but in the French and Spanish languages also, the letter *l*, doubled, is frequently changed into a sound closely resembling that of *y* in the word *ye*. In Spanish, again, *n* has two sounds so different that one is commonly indicated by a distinctive mark; and *b* and *d* are sometimes pronounced as mere mutes, and sometimes aspirated into soft sounds, closely resembling the English sounds of *v* and *th*. There are other diversities in the sounds of consonants, in the German as well as others of the Continental languages. And there is no reason for restricting the letter *c*, in the Latin language, to one single sound, nor for changing, in the pronunciation of Latin, the sounds which the consonants have in the French, Spanish, Italian and English languages, and most of them, also, in the German.

For, suppose the letter *c* to have had, in Latin, the sound of *k* before *a*, and to have been aspirated before *e*. And Quintilian says that an excessive aspiration of *c* prevailed for a time; intimating that a certain aspiration of *c* was never excessive nor erroneous. It might, then, have taken, at first, even the difficult, guttural sound of *ch*—a sound, which few teachers of Hebrew, German and Greek can



utter so precisely and clearly as to make it imitable to Englishmen and Americans. But from the sure tendency of all pronunciation to greater facility of utterance, if not always to euphony, that very difficult guttural sound of *ch* could not fail to pass, at length, in many words, into the softer sound heard in the English words *church* and *cheese*. And this sound of *ch*, again, in many words, would naturally, almost necessarily, be changed to the sound of *s*, or at least to that of *ts*, as in the speech of young children, who, for a while, almost invariably say *tseese* for *cheese*. Now, a soft sound of *ch*, or *c* aspirated, has been retained in *c* before *e* and *i*, in many Italian words, and also modified into the lisping sound of *th*, which the letter *c* has before *e* and *i* in many Spanish words. Beyond all question, therefore, not only the sound of *ts*, heard in some German words, as a proper sound of the letter *c*, but also the simple sound of *s*, according to French and English usage, was represented by the letter *c* before *e* and *i*, in many Latin words, while the Latin was the vernacular tongue of extensive provinces in Europe, as well as a living, spoken language among scholars in general. For there is clear evidence that before Quintilian's time, the Latin termination *itius* was sometimes written *icius*. And since the termination *itius*, interchangeable with *icius*, naturally and inevitably glides into the sound represented by *ishius*, this indisputable fact entirely excludes and effectually explodes the idea that *c* had only the sound of *k* before *i*.

Nor does the fact that Quintilian speaks of *k* as almost obsolete in Latin, in his time, make the hard sound of *c* indispensable before *e* and *i*. For the sound of *k* was virtually supplied by the letters *qu*, in many words; as in the adverb and conjunction *quum*, which was also often written *cum*, both as an adverb and as a conjunction. And at some periods, the letter *q* without *u*, was used as equivalent to *k*. But further still. There is a remarkable fact concerning the preposition *cum*, which has been

strangely overlooked by many, who have undertaken to make the Latin *c* identical with *k* and the Greek *kappa*. Their favorite argument, on that point, is that the Greeks wrote the Latin name *Cæsar*, *Καῖσαρος*. They fail to observe that the Latin diphthong, *æ*, was often written *ai*, and had the sound of the English word *aye*; and arguing entirely from the English spelling of the name *Cesar*, they conclude that *c*, in Latin, was always hard before *e*. Now it would be just as reasonable to argue, on the other hand, that *c*, in Latin, was soft before *u* and *o*, because the Latin preposition *cum*, *Eng. with*, and the Latin prefix *con*, *Eng. together with*, were identical with the Greek preposition *συν*, *Eng. with* and the Greek prefix *συν*, *Eng. together with*; and again the Latin compound verb, *confero*, *Eng. to bring together*, with the Greek compound verb, *συνμειρω*, *Eng. to bring together*. The same reasoning which brings the Greek name *Καῖσαρος* to prove that the Latin *c* was hard before *e*, because the Latin name *Cæsar* is written in English *Cesar*, would not only logically change the Latin verb *confero* to *sonfero*, but also would legitimately favor a farther change of the English verb *confer* to *sonfer*. Then why not follow out and insist upon such changes, if it can be proved expedient, or for any cause or purpose desirable, to make *c* hard in the second syllable of *accentus*, *Eng. accent*, *accepto*, *Eng. accept*, *ascendo*, *Eng. ascend*, and in *anticipo*, *Eng. anticipate*? There are hundreds of such words, which the English, in common with the Italian, French and Spanish languages, has taken bodily from the ancient Latin. That grand old language, through some remarkable and very salutary influence, communicated to such words, in all those languages, a soft sound of the consonant *c*, before *e* and *i*, instead of imparting to it the hard, strictly mute sound, the sound of *k*, before all the vowels, according to the doctrine, or *dictum*, of our new linguists. But these would, if possible, fasten upon many words which are strictly euphonic, with the soft sound of *c* before *e* and *i*, a shocking *hiatus*, by doubling the hard,

mute sound of *c*—the sound of *k*, in the middle of those words. They strangely forget how repulsive was any *hiatus* in the middle of words to the ancient Romans, who affected to be hardly less ambitious of excellence in pronunciation than the fastidious Greeks. The least *hiatus* in any combination of syllables, is incompatible with euphony, or excellence in the pronunciation of any cultivated language. It can be tolerated only in the stammering, staggering, stumbling utterance of the rudest barbarians. For euphony abhors every stupid *hiatus*, as surely as nature abhors a *vacuum*.

The letter *c* with the mute sound of *k*, can be doubled before *a*, as in the Latin word *bacca*, without a troublesome *hiatus* in pronunciation. But no one can give the hard, mute sound of *k* to the second *c*, in the word *ecce*, or in the word *accentus*, and pronounce those words distinctly in that way, without a palpable, and very disagreeable *hiatus*; such as the ancient Romans, with their cherished regard for the Greek tongue, would not have tolerated. A similar *hiatus* is inevitable, when the hard, mute sound of *k* is given to the letter *c* before *e* or *i*, in such words as *exceptio*, *ascensus*, *descendo*, *rescindo*, and many others, almost numberless. This, then, effectually disposes of the common, but wholly groundless remark of the new-fangled pronouncers, that the ancient Romans cannot be supposed to have pronounced *bacca*, *bakkah*, and *ecce*, *ecse*. For, why not? Certainly no people, who had any due regard to euphony, and therefore abhorred every repulsive *hiatus*, can be supposed to have overlooked that perfectly natural and almost inevitable method of securing a smooth and easy utterance to *c* before *e* and *i*, in such connections; an utterance wholly unattainable with the hard sound of *c*, which is the strictly mute sound of *k*. This also accounts for the remark of Quintilian, which is otherwise wholly unaccountable, and in fact, unintelligible, that some Latin grammarians of his day still thought the letter *k* essential before the letter *a*; as if *c*, in some words, had been liable

to be pronounced even before *a*, with a soft sound, and not the hard, mute sound of *k*. And the tendency of a nice regard to euphony, in such variation of the sound of letters strikingly appears in the speech of Frenchmen and Spaniards, when they soften the doubled *l*, almost to the sound of *y*, as it is heard in the word *ye*.

But the plain history of the Latin language from the time of Quintilian to the sixth century, traced in the writings of that period, affords not less support to the idea that the letter *c* had sometimes the sound of *s*, or some other sibilant and soft sound, before all vowels except *a*, than to the idea that it had only the sound of *k*, before all vowels. There is still extant a remarkable manuscript of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, known to scholars as the *Codex Bezae*, or the Cambridge Manuscript, and regarded by the most learned critics as one of the oldest manuscripts now extant of any part of the New Testament. A *fac simile* of that manuscript, in uncial letters, is contained in a large folio volume, which has the Greek Text on the left hand page, and on the right hand page a very ancient Latin version. And the opposite pages are written throughout in characters so nearly alike, without spaces between the words, that the Greek and the Latin might be taken, at the first glance, for the same language, if the letters *q*, *h* and *s* did not appear, here and there, in the Latin, on the right hand, and the letter *k* in the Greek on the left. For it is, above all, remarkable in that manuscript, that the character *C* is used for the Greek letter *sigma*, in all positions, at the beginning and the end of words, and also in the middle; and double as well as single; having everywhere a sibilant sound in the Greek words. And in many places, the Greek preposition and prefix *συν* (*sun*) on the left hand page corresponds to the Latin preposition *cum* and the prefix *con*, on the right hand page; the Greek being in these characters, CYN, and the Latin in these CUM and CON.

To one, therefore, who looks at such a Greek manuscript

as old at least as the sixth or the fifth century, and then turns to a page of the Latin manuscript, not less ancient, it is not easy to imagine that the character C, in the Latin of that period, could not have had a soft or sibilant sound before any vowels. The mere fact that the character C denoted both the Greek letter  $\sigma$  (*sigma*), and the Latin *c*, does not prove that the Latin *c* had sometimes the sound of *s*. For the Latin character P also denoted the Greek letter *rho*, while another character was used by the Greeks to denote their letter  $\Pi$  (*pi*), which had the sound of *p*. But, in ancient Latin, again, the letters *r* and *s* were often interchangeable, the same words being sometimes written with an *r* and sometimes with an *s*; as, *honor*, *honos*, *Papirius*, *Papisius*. And this fact shows plainly how the two sounds of *k* and *s* might have been assigned to the one letter *c*, without doing violence to the habits of the ancient Romans in their very free use of various letters, both in writing and speaking.

In view, then, of those remains of ancient writings in Greek and Latin, it seems almost unquestionable that the character C, in Latin, had, from a very early period, a soft, sibilant or aspirated sound before the vowels *e* and *i*, if not sometimes before *o* and *u*, as *c* with the cedilla has in the French words *garçon*, *façade* and others; and in some Spanish words, also, before *a*.

It is true that Quintilian represents the letters *c* and *g* as interchangeable in many Latin words during some periods. And the Latin *c* is regarded by many, not without some show of reason, as a letter which originally corresponded to the Greek *gamma*, the third letter of the Greek alphabet. But suppose, now, on this ground, that the Latin letters *c* and *g* were both alike derived from the Greek *gamma*, or most directly allied to it, and that when the Latin *k* became obsolete, the Latin *g* shared its place along with *q* and the combination *qu*. Still it would be impossible to show from any facts in the history of European languages, that the Latin *g* should have in all words the hard sound; even



though it has that sound before the vowels *e* and *i*, in many English words derived from the Saxon. For the letter *g* has a soft sound before *e* and *i* in all the languages directly descended from the Latin; and also in some German words. And in modern Greek the letter *gamma*, *γ*, is sometimes soft before *υ*, as well as *ε* and *ι*. Historically, therefore, the usage of the Greek language fails to sustain the hard sound of *g* before *e* and *i* in Latin. These, now, are facts which go far to prove the ancient origin of the soft sounds of *c* and *g* before *e* and *i*. Such facts can never be set aside by new theories of speculative linguists. Nor would it be expedient, if it were easy, to accustom English and American students to the hard sound of *g* before *e* and *i*, in the scores of Latin words, which have been long associated in their minds with corresponding English words, taken directly from the Latin—for example: *agito*, Eng. agitate; *diligens*, Eng. diligent; *vigilans*, Eng. vigilant; *flagitiosus*, Eng. flagitious; *generosus*, Eng. generous; *generalis*, Eng. general; and many others.

To what purpose then, is it to require American and English students to pronounce *c* like *k* in all Latin words, and to make *g*, in Latin, always hard? Such pronunciation can only tend to make the acquisition of the French, Spanish and Italian languages more and more difficult, instead of facilitating the study of those languages, as the knowledge of Latin, with the common pronunciation suggested and sanctioned by the sounds of the consonants in those languages, certainly does. It is impossible to imagine any useful result from the proposed change of that long received pronunciation, in connection with the use and study of the English language. The only end for which it seems to be designed and adapted is to establish a mere whim, suggested by an erroneous and extreme view of some hints long since thrown out by certain German grammarians, in the midst of their fanciful, conjectural and superfluous speculations, and to impose that whim upon American and English students to their great inconvenience and hinderance, both in their

classical studies and in their acquisition of a practical knowledge of modern languages.

And here the fanciful notion that the sounds of the vowels in Latin words are invariable, demands a fitting notice. No vowels, with the possible exception of the French *u*, which is very peculiar, have ever been restricted, in any language, to one unvarying sound; at least not to an accurate ear, trained to discriminate between sounds, as short and long; whatever may be said to the contrary by some who speak and attempt to teach French, Spanish, Italian and German. Quintilian says (Lib. I., c. 7): "Among the Greeks the letter *o* had diverse power, long and short, as among us." The vowel *o*, then, in Latin, had the power both of the Greek  $\omega$ , *omega*, and the Greek *o*, *omicron*. It is true that the short sound and the long sound of vowels, in Latin, cannot be strictly regarded as two different sounds. But they are entirely distinct, and not strictly the same sound, especially in the vowel *o*, as it is heard twice, short and long, in the English word *propose*.

The long and the short sounds of *u* are also entirely distinct in the Latin word *tumulus*; as distinct as in the English word *tubular*. And Quintilian says, again, that "*i* has the nature both of a long and a short vowel." In view, therefore, of his authoritative testimony concerning the sounds of the vowels in Latin, the attempted and widely accepted distinction between "the English method" and "the Continental method" of pronouncing some of the vowels, and much more, the proposed distinction between the English pronunciation and "the Roman pronunciation," so called, can hardly fail to mislead young students. Every such nice distinction between the English language and other languages, as to the sounds of the vowels, is a practical mistake. For the short sounds of the vowels, which are by far the most frequent in all languages, are precisely the same in all, with the single exception of the Greek *v*, *upsilon*. And all the sounds of the vowels ever recognized in any language may

be heard, here and there, in English words which are in common use. Even the peculiar sound of the French *u* is often heard in the best pronunciation of the English word *tureen*, in the first syllable of *bureau*, and in other words, which are thoroughly English, though chiefly derived from the French. And many of the best Latin scholars in America, if not also in England, have always used the sound of *a* in *father* for the long sound of *a* in Latin words. The long sounds of *e* and *i* in "the Continental Method," are also fully met by the English sounds of *e* and *i* in the words *obey* and *machine*. On the other hand, the French *u* confessedly fails to meet all the sounds of *u* in Latin words. And of late, many French teachers of Latin represent the long *u*, in Latin words, by the French diphthong, *ou*, just as the ancient Greeks sometimes represented it by their diphthong *ou*. It is worth while, therefore, to note here some of the questions which scattered hints, in the writings of Quintilian, make inevitable, and at the same time, leave, in some instances, wholly unanswerable.

In ancient Latin the letter *u* had sometimes the sound of a vowel and sometimes the force of a consonant, as in the word *servus*, pronounced *servus*. Quintilian says (Lib. I, c. 4.) that in such words the first *u* had the force of the *digamma*; a sound of *v* or *F*, which the Greeks sometimes introduced between two vowels to avoid an awkward *hiatus*. His language is this: "Nevertheless, also, that Æolic letter itself [the *digamma*] with which we speak *servus*"—pronounced with the *digamma*, *servus* or *serfus*, Eng. *servant* and *serf*—"follows us, even if its form has been rejected." But what does he mean, when he says in the same place, (Lib. XII, c. 10.) that the two vowels in the words *equos* and *equum* "make a sound such as was not known among the Greeks, and therefore could not be expressed by their letters?" This is a question which cannot be easily answered. But this is not all; he says in another place (Lib. I, c. 4.) that "there is also a middle—or an intermediate (Lat. *medius*) sound of *u* and *i*, for we do not

speak *optumum* as we speak *optimum*." But, when we find, in some editions, another reading, to this effect; "For we do not speak *optimum* as we speak *opimum*," the question comes up, whether there was in Latin a sound intermediate between the vowels *u* and *i*, considered as either short or long, or whether each of those vowels had a middle, or third sound. And this, again, is a question not easily answered, and certainly one not fully answered by any testimony of ancient writings in volumes now extant.

It is, indeed, clear and certain, from the testimony of Quintilian, that the letter *u* had, in his day, two (if not three) distinct sounds. But all this does not sanction the idea, recently insisted on, with singular zeal, by some American scholars and grammarians, that the letter *v* had, in "the Roman pronunciation" of the Latin language, the sound which the English letter *w* takes as a consonant. This idea is very amusing, when it is expressed in the first lessons of Latin grammar, in connection with the remark that the Latin language had no *w*. But what an exhibition American boys would make of themselves, repeating the Latin words *vivo*, *visis*, *vivit*, *vivimus*, *vivitis*, *vivunt*, with this pronunciation, *wee-wo*, *wee-wees*, *wee-weet*, *wee-weemoos*, *wee-wee-tees*, *wee-woont*. And what a figure an American scholar would cut, pronouncing the Latin word, *convivalis*, *cone-wee-wah-lees*, Eng. *convivial*. He would certainly suggest the idea, if he did not serve for an example, of excessive conviviality. Yet such is the "Roman pronunciation," so called, and such the inevitable result of any attempt to give the vowels in Latin one unvarying sound.

Many boys and girls, as well as men and women, in America, have great power of endurance. But any *lingo* so barbarous would soon prove intolerable to all. The idea that the ancient Romans, in their pronunciation of Latin, ever tolerated such a barbarous *hiatus*, in any words often repeated, is preposterous. And it is a happy circumstance for the cause of high rhetoric, that one of its finest speci-

mens, in the famous despatch of the great general and orator, Julius Cæsar, "*veni, vidi, vici*," was committed to written characters, and not handed down orally, in such childish utterances as these: *way-nee, wee-dee, wee-kee*. Even in the English language, *w* is never used as a consonant in the middle of words, with the exception of a few, like *awake, bewail* and *beware*; chiefly compound words, in which a slight *hiatus* between the two parts of the compound is of small account. And the consonant sound of *w* before *a*, in any words, produces a very slight *hiatus*, almost imperceptible. But that barbarous pronunciation of *v* with the sound of *w*, which is proposed and prescribed in the mis-named "Roman pronunciation," is wholly set at naught by the plain testimony of Quintilian, where he speaks (Lib. I, c. 4.) of the sound which the Latins gave to the letter *v*, in *vulgus* and *servus*, as the *digamma*. And it is to be hoped that such a barbarous pronunciation, whatever it may be called, will be henceforth regarded, not only by thorough scholars, but also by young students, at least in England and America, as a thoroughly punctured and exploded bubble. For it is, at the best, an empty and puerile conceit, especially adapted, and apparently, in part, designed, for the amusement of young students, in all nations, except, possibly, Germans. To thorough scholars whose knowledge of Latin is verified and established by the constant perusal of ancient writings of every period, and to diligent students of those languages which are most directly descended from the Latin, that whimsical conceit is sheer nonsense.

How useless, as a guide to young students, is the new-fangled method of pronunciation, appears from the fact that a scholar of no mean attainments, Professor Gildersleeve, attempting to explain that method, in his Latin Primer, makes these very strange and almost unintelligible remarks. "*Ch* is not a genuine Latin sound. In Latin words it is a *k*; in Greek words a *kh*; commonly pronounced as *ch* in German (an aspirated *h*)." What, now, does all this



signify? Unless the phrase "an aspirated *h*" is a misprint for "an aspirated *k*"—whatever that may be—or possibly a mistake for a *guttural h*, or a *guttural k*, then what, pray, is "an aspirated *h*," in other words, an aspirated *aspirate*? And then, again, which of the three, or four, sounds of *ch* in German is supposed to represent and guide the pronunciation of *ch* in Greek words, according to that Latin Primer? What, in fine, is to come of such fanciful changes, as to any practical gain, in the study of Latin and Greek, or in the use of any modern language? Simply nothing; absolutely nothing.

N. E. CORNWALL.

---

#### SOME LETTERS OF ST. BASIL.

(Continued.)

To what good account his correspondence with the orthodox outside of Cappadocia was turned by St. Basil, will appear from the letters which we print next, giving them at length because they illustrate so well the Catholic polity of the Primitive Church. In the autumn of 375, after his return from Pisidia, Basil made a journey northwards into Pontus, to re-establish amicable relations with the bishops of that province, who had become unfriendly through the arts of Eustathius of Sebaste, and the violence of Atarbius of Neo-Cæsarea. The former secretly put slanders into circulation, while the latter, who held Sabellian or Marcellian opinions, inveighed against Basil publicly in his discourses in church. It had been customary for some of the Bishops of this province to be present at the annual gathering at Cæsarea, on the festival of St. Eupychius; but this year they sent no deputation, and had for some time omitted

to send the customary *literæ formatæ*—being influenced partly by the intrigue of of Eustathius, and partly, as the Editor suggests, being willing not to compromise themselves by too great intimacy with Basil, now that the heretics were plotting against him at court. St. Basil takes notice of the omission of these tokens of communion in Ep. 203, written before his journey, and expostulates with them for their breach of Catholic unity, as follows :

*Ep. 203.—To the Bishops of Pontus.*

“ I have had great desire of meeting with you, but there has always been some hindrance in the way of my wish. For I was prevented either by weakness of body (which you are not at all ignorant of—how much it is with me, being my companion from early youth to this old age, and chastising me according to the righteous judgment of God, who ordereth all things in wisdom), or by the cares of the Churches, or by contests with those who gainsay the word of truth. Wherefore unto this present I continue in much affliction and grief, knowing that I am wanting as regards you. For I—hearing from God, who for this reason undertook the sojourn in the flesh that by the pattern of His deeds He might direct our life, and with His own voice might announce to us the Gospel of the Kingdom, that ‘ by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, that ye love one another ;’ and that, being about to complete the economy in the flesh, the Lord left His own peace as the farewell gift to His own disciples, saying : ‘ Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you’—I, hearing this, am not able to persuade myself that I can be worthy to be called a servant of Jesus Christ without the love towards one another, and without being, as far as in me lies, at peace with all men. And indeed I waited a long time, if perhaps there might be a visitation of us from your love. For ye are not ignorant that we, being set forth before all the public as the rocks jutting out into the sea, receive the fury of the heretical waves, which breaking upon us are kept from washing over that which is behind us. But when I say ‘ we,’ I do not refer it to the power of men, but to the grace of God, who showeth His power in the weakness of men, as says the prophet from the face of the Lord, saying : ‘ Fear ye not me who place the sand for a bound of the sea ?’ for by that

weakest and most despised thing of all, the sand, the Powerful has bound the great and mighty sea. Since therefore it is after this sort with us, it would have been well to continue to send regularly from your love some of your own brethren to visit us who are in affliction, and that letters of love should come to us more frequently, in the one case confirming our zeal, or in the other case, even if we are at fault, correcting us. For we do not deny that we are chargeable with innumerable faults, being men and living in the flesh.

"But since for some time past, either ye have neglected what ye owed to us, most honored brethren, through forgetting what is fitting, or ye did not consider us worthy of a loving visitation, being prepossessed with the slanders of some against us, behold now we ourselves begin the correspondence, and we profess to hold ourselves ready at your demand to put away the blame imputed to us, if only those who revile us will undertake to stand face to face with us before your piety. For then both we being convicted shall know our sin, and you after the conviction shall have pardon of the Lord for withdrawing yourselves from communion with us the sinners; and the accusers also shall have a reward, as bringing to light our concealed wickedness. But if you condemn us before conviction, we indeed shall be in no way hurt, except by being deprived of that possession most valuable to us of all, your love; but you, not having us to suffer the same thing, will seem to fight against the Gospel which says: 'Doth our law judge a man before it hear him and know what he doeth?' And he who pours reproaches upon us, not bringing proof of what is said, shall manifestly bring an evil name upon himself from his unseemly use of words. For how otherwise is it possible to speak of him who slanders (*τὸν διαβάλλοντα*) than by putting upon him the name which he adopts by the thing itself. Let not then him who reproaches us be a slanderer (*διαβολός*), but an accuser; or rather, let him not accept the name of an accuser, but let him be a brother admonishing us in love, and bringing the proof for correction. Nor be ye hearers of revilings, but weighers of the proof, lest we be left incurable, our sin not being made manifest to us.

"Nor let that notion take hold of you that ye who inhabit the sea coasts suffer not as the many and have no need of help from others, so that ye have no need of the communion with others. For the Lord indeed separated the islands from the continent by the sea, but he bound the islanders

to those who inhabit the continent by charity. Nothing, brethren, separates us from one another unless we establish the separation in the purpose of the mind. We have one Lord, one faith, the same hope. If ye count yourselves the head of the Catholic Church, the head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you. And if ye arrange yourselves in any other order among the ecclesiastical members, ye are not able to say to those of us who are arranged in the same body, we have no need of you. For the hands have need of each other, and the feet make each other firm, and the eyes have the clearness of vision in their agreement. For indeed we confess our own weakness, and we seek your support. For we know that though you be not present with us in the body, yet you will afford us by the help of your prayers great advantage in these stringent times. It is not becoming before men, nor well-pleasing to God, that you should use such words, which are not used even by the Gentiles who know not God. But we hear them, that even though they inhabit a country in all things sufficient unto itself,<sup>1</sup> yet on account of the uncertainty of what is coming they make leagues with one another and pursue commerce, as having some gain. But we, being of those fathers who made the law that the symbols of communion in little characters should be carried from one end of the earth to the other, and that all should be citizens and residents in all places—we now cut ourselves off from the world, and neither are ashamed at our loneliness nor consider that the breaking of concord bears any blame, nor do we fear lest the dreadful prophecy of our Lord overtake us, saying: 'Because iniquity abounds, the love of the many shall wax cold.'

"Suffer not these things to be in this way, most honored brethren, but console us for the past by letters of peace and loving salutations, as if relieving with gentle touch the wound of our heart which ye have given us by the past indifference. And if ye wish to come to us, and of yourselves to observe our disease, whether those things are really so which ye have heard, or whether our transgressions are told to you more hardly by additions of falsehood, let this also be. We are ready to receive your presence with supine hands, and to yield ourselves to your strict enquiry, only let love rule over what is done. Or, if ye wish to appoint

---

<sup>1</sup> i. e.—The kingdom of this world as contrasted with the Kingdom of Heaven.

a place among yourselves to which we may come and fulfil the duty of a visitation to you, and afford the requisite test of ourselves, so that we may both heal the past and leave no place to slander for the future, let this also be. For in every way, though we bear around this weak body, yet as long as we breathe we are under a responsibility to omit nothing of that which is for the edification of the churches of Christ. Defraud us not, then, of this consolation, lest ye lead us to the necessity of opening our grief to others. For ye know, brethren, that until now we keep this grief to ourselves, being ashamed to announce your alienation from us to those at a distance who communicate with us, that we may not grieve them, or give joy to those who hate us. These things I alone have written at this time; but I have sent by the advice of all the brethren in Cappadocia, who also advised me not to make use of the ministry, such as it is, of a letter, but of a man, who shall be able to state fully by his own understanding, which he has through the grace of God, those things which we have omitted in the Epistle, fearing lest we extend the discourse to undue length. We speak of our most beloved and religious brother Peter, the fellow-presbyter; whom do ye receive in love, and send forward to us in peace, that he may be to us the messenger of good."

At the same time with the above circular letter to the Bishops of Pontus in general, St. Basil sent an epistle to the Church of Neo-Cæsarea in particular, which had withheld the customary letters and visits since the accession of Atarbius to the Episcopate. In consequence of the violence of the Bishop against him, Basil writes directly to the presbyters and laity, appealing to them not to let calumny poison their minds against him; since not only had he been joined with them in the communion of the Catholic Church, but there were special ties binding him to their city and people. He had been brought up in the vicinity of Neo-Cæsarea, and had been instructed by his grandmother Macrina, under whose care he was, in the faith which she had learned from Gregory Thaumaturgus, the Apostle of Pontus, and founder of the Church of Neo-Cæsarea; from which faith Basil declares he never had swerved from that



day until now. The letter, (204), is a long one ; we give the concluding paragraphs :

“ But what could be a clearer demonstration of our faith than that we were brought up by our grandmother, that blessed woman sprung from among yourselves? I mean the celebrated Macrina; by whom we were taught the words of the most blessed Gregory, which she treasured up in her memory and kept herself, and by which she moulded and formed us in our infancy to the doctrines of piety. And when we ourselves came to have the power of thought, and reason was developed in us by growth in years, we travelled much by land and sea, and when we found any walking by the rule of piety handed down, these we adopted for fathers, and made them guides to our souls in the way of God. And until this hour, by the grace of Him who hath called us unto the knowledge of Himself with an holy calling, we have knowingly received into our hearts no word contrary to the healthful teaching ; nor have we at any time defiled our souls with the infamous blasphemy of the Arians. But if at any time we have received to communion those who have come forth from that teacher, they concealing the disease in the depths, or not gainsaying what was said by us, we have so received them not relying upon ourselves alone in judging them, but following the sentence put forth concerning them by our fathers. For I, having received letters from the most blessed father Athanasius, the Bishop of Alexandria, which also I have at hand and show to those who wish, in which he plainly laid it down that whoever wished to renounce the Arian heresy should be received without hesitation on confessing the Nicene Creed, and cited as agreeing in this decision all the Bishops of Macedonia and Achaia—I, judging it necessary to follow such a man, because of the weighty authority of those who made the rule, and also being desirous myself to receive the reward of peace-making, have enrolled those confessing this faith in the number of communicants.

“ But it would be more righteous to judge our affairs not by one or two of those who may not walk according to the truth, but by the number of those bishops throughout the inhabited world who communicate with us through the grace of the Lord. Let them go over in order the Pisidians, the Lycaonians, the Isaurians, both the Phrygias, as much of Armenia as in your neighborhood, the Macedonians, the

Achaïans, the Illyrians, the Gauls, the Spaniards, all Italy, the Sicilians, the Africans, the healthy part of Egypt, what is left of Syria—who all send letters to us, and again receive letters from us, of whom ye may learn, by the letters brought from thence, and be taught by the letters sent back from hence to them, that we are all of one accord, thinking the same thing. So that he who separates from communion with us, let it not escape your accuracy, breaks himself off from the whole Church. Consider, brethren, with whom have ye communion? When ye are not received by us, who else will recognize you? Do not drive us to the necessity of counselling something harsh concerning that Church most beloved by us. Do not make me—what now I conceal in my own heart, groaning and bewailing the badness of the times, that, there being no cause, the greatest of the Churches, and those that have had from old time the relation of brothers, these now stand apart—make me not to bewail these things to all who communicate with me. Force me not to speak words which until now, by the bridle of reason, I have kept concealed within myself. Better were it that we were out of the way and the Churches at peace with one another, than that through our childish littleness of soul so great an evil were brought upon the people of God. Ask your fathers and they will tell you that although the parishes seemed to be divided by distance of place, yet that they were one in mind, and were governed by one opinion. Unceasing were the minglings of the people; unceasing were the visits of the clergy; so much of love towards one another was in the flocks themselves, that each counted the other a teacher and guide in the matters of the Lord.”

This nervous expostulation shows us the man Basil better than any labored dissertation upon his character. But it did no good. The mission of the presbyter, Peter, seems to have led to an understanding with the other bishops of Pontus, and on his return Basil sent another presbyter named Meletius to Elpidius, one of their number, proposing to him to arrange a meeting at Comana, a place on the border, which would be convenient for Basil, as he was about to make a visitation of that part of Cappadocia. But the letter to Neo-Cæsarea brought no response, and Peter could only report the agreement of the whole Church with

Atarbius their bishop, in hostility to St. Basil, and the accusations on which that hostility was based. Basil therefore wrote again to the presbyters of this Church—and we may read the letter with peculiar interest at the present time, showing as it does that agitations about ritual and kindred matters do not belong exclusively to the nineteenth century.

*Ep. 207.—To the Clergy of Neo-Cæsarea.*

“The agreement in hatred of us, and the following, one and all, the leader in the war against us, persuaded me likewise to be silent towards all, and to make advances neither of friendly letters nor of association with any one, but to nurse my grief in quiet. But since it is necessary not to be silent regarding the slanders (not that we may avenge ourselves by the contradiction, but that we may not permit the lie to make way, nor leave those who are deceived in their hurt), it seemed to me necessary to put this before all, and to write to your prudence; although when I wrote the other day to the whole presbytery in common, I was not thought worthy of an answer from you. Do not flatter, O brethren, those who are infusing evil doctrines into your souls, nor suffer yourselves to look on when in your own knowledge the people of God are being overturned with evil teachings. Sabellius, the Libyan, and Marcellus, the Galatian, alone of all have dared to write and teach those things which now among you those who lead the people are endeavoring to put forward as their own inventions—babbling in speech and unable to bring their sophisms and fallacies into any plausible arrangement. These preach to the people speakable and unspeakable things against us, and in every way shun our company. For what reason? Is it not that they anticipate their own conviction of evil dogma? Who, indeed, have become so impudent against us as to compose dreams upon us, slandering our teaching as hurtful; but if they could take into their heads all the phantasies of the fall months, they would be able to fix no charge of blasphemy upon us, there being many in every Church who bear witness to the truth.

“And if they are asked the cause of this implacable war, they speak of psalms, and of a kind of singing different from that which prevails among you, and of things of that sort of which they ought to be ashamed. And we are

accused because we have men exercised in godliness,<sup>1</sup> separated from the world and from all the cares of this life, which the Lord likened to thorns, because they do not permit the word to bear fruit, such as these bear about in their body the dying of Jesus, and taking up their cross, they follow God. But I would count it the honor of all my life, that these offences are mine, and that I have men with me, under my instruction, who have chosen this exercise. But now I hear that in Egypt there is virtue of the same sort in men; and perhaps some in Palestine observe the polity according to the Gospel. And I hear that there are some perfect and blessed men in Mesopotamia. But we are children in comparison with the perfect. And if there are women electing to live evangelically, preferring virginity to marriage, leading captive the will of the flesh, and living in that blessed mourning, blessed are they for their choice, wheresoever they may be in the world. But with us these things are little, of those as yet learning the elements and being led on towards godliness. However, if they introduce any disorder into the life of the women, I do not undertake their defence. But this I testify unto you, that what up to this time, Satan, the father of lies, has not dared to say, these things the rash hearts and unbridled mouths are always speaking without scruple. But I wish you to know that we boast of having companies both of men and women whose citizenship is in heaven, who have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts, who care not for meat and clothing, but, being undistracted and diligent in the Lord, continue in supplication night and day. Whose mouth does not speak the words of men; but they sing hymns to our God continually, and work with their own hands, that they may have to give to them that need.

"And as regards the accusation concerning psalm-singing by which especially those who slander us terrify the more simple, I have this to say; that the customs which now prevail are consonant and harmonious with all the churches of God. For with us the people rise early in the night for the house of prayer, and in labor and grief, and with mingling of tears they confess to God, and at last, rising from the prayers, they stand in order for the psalmody.

---

<sup>1</sup> Basil was a promoter of the monastic life, then newly spreading throughout the Church.

And at one time, indeed, being divided into two parts, they chant antiphonally; in this way both strengthening their meditation upon the oracles, and also directing the attention and the sober-mindedness of their hearts within themselves. Then again entrusting to one to lead the song, the others respond, and so with variety of psalmody they bring the night to an end, joining in prayers between times; and at break of day they all in common, as with one mouth and one heart, offer to the Lord the psalm of the confession, each one making his own the words of repentance. But if for this cause you flee from us, you will flee the Egyptians, you will flee also both the Libyas, the Thebans, those of Palestine, the Arabs, the Phenicians, the Syrians, and those dwelling by the Euphrates—all, in a word, by whom vigils and prayers and the common psalmody are valued.

"But, says one, these were not in the time of the great Gregory. 'But neither were the litanies' which you now make use of. And this I say not to accuse you for I would that ye all should live in tears and continual penitence. And since we do no otherwise than use litanies for our sins—only not in human words as you, but in the oracles of the Spirit—we have our God propitious to us. But what witness that these things were not in the time of the wonderful Gregory have ye who keep nothing to this day of that which was from him? Gregory was not veiled at the time of prayer. For how? He was a true disciple of the Apostle who said, 'Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head,' and 'A man ought not to cover his head, being the image and glory of God.' That pure soul shunned oaths, and, being worthy of the communion of the Spirit, he used the yea and the nay, because of the commandment of the Lord, who said, 'But I say unto you, swear not at all.' That one did not dare to call his brother a fool, for he feared the threatening of the Lord. Fury and anger and bitterness proceeded not out of his mouth. He hated reviling, because it cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. Envy and arrogance were driven away from that guileless soul. He would not stand at the altar before he was reconciled with his brother. A discourse falsely and artfully constructed

<sup>1</sup> "*Litanies*.—By this word are not meant supplications or processions as in the Greek Euchology, but prayers accommodated to penitence." *Note of the Editors.*



to slander any one he so hated as knowing that a lie is of the devil, and that the Lord will destroy all who speak falsehood. If there is nothing in you of these things, but ye are free from all, then in reality ye are disciples of the disciple of the Lord's commandments. But if not, see that ye are not straining out the gnat, being very precise about the sound of the voice in the psalmody, and letting go the greatest of the commandments. The necessity of the defence has led me to these words, that ye may be taught to cast out the beam out of your own eyes, and then take out the motes of others. Nevertheless, we yield all, but there is nothing that is not searched out of God. Only let the chief things be made firm, and be ye silent as to novelties in the faith. Do not reject the *hypostases*. Do not deny the name of Christ. Do not misinterpret the words of Gregory. Otherwise, as long as we breathe and are able to speak, it is impossible for us to be silent in so great a ruin of souls."

We are not informed whether the Bishops of Pontus came to Comana to meet St. Basil as he had invited them; but during the Autumn, Basil himself made a journey into Pontus, and was successful in restoring Catholic communion between the churches of Pontus and Cappadocia. On his return he paid a visit to his brother Peter, who resided on the family estate near Neo-Cæsarea; and the effect of his proximity to that city was ludicrous. The people were roused against him by the report that he was coming into the city to put down those opposed to him; some fled openly and some secretly; others spread abroad omens and dreams about him, and made him the topic of excited conversation in the taverns over their wine-cups; the whole city, in fact, was thrown into an insane and causeless uproar. It was a wonderful tribute to the spiritual power of the sick old man, however foolish the demonstration. But their foolish excitement showed St. Basil that nothing was to be gained by going into Neo-Cæsarea—indeed, he had had no intention of doing so—and he contented himself with writing Epistle 210, "to the chief men of Neo-Cæsarea," in which he stated the cause of his being in their vicinity, namely to rest a few days at his brother's

house; and in which he also warned them against the Sabelian heresy of their Bishop, and explained the doctrine of the three hypostases. As this epistle was written to laymen, it shows that St. Basil in no way entertained the notion, current among some in these days, that the laity are not to be instructed in theological dogmas.

And now, as affairs are beginning to wear a more hopeful aspect, and bid fair to settle themselves without the necessity of further recourse to the West and its Emperor; and Basil, as we have seen, is able to appeal to the fact that he is in communion by letter with the great mass of the church universal—it is time for the Bishop of Rome to appear once more upon the scene. It will be remembered that the letters to Rome of 373, were sent back as unsatisfactory, by the hand of Evagrius, in 373, and that a form was dictated by Damasus, in which application must be made to him, if the Easterns had any thing further to ask him. As the Bishops of Méletius' communion treated this arrogant demand with silent contempt, and wrote nothing more to Rome, Damasus determined to acknowledge Paulinus as Bishop of Antioch, and so to make the adherents of Miletius feel his power. The following letter of Basil to Meletius informs him briefly of the events of the latter part of the year 375 :

*Ep. 216—To Meletius, Bishop of Antioch.*

"Many and various travels have led us away from our own country. For we went as far as Pisidia so as with the Bishops there to settle the affairs of the brethren in Isauria. And thence the journey led us into Pontus, Eustathius troubling Dazimon over much, and persuading many of those there to cut themselves off from our Church. And we came also to the home of our brother Peter, which, because it is near Neo-Cæsarea, afforded a pretext for a tumult to those there, and gave occasion for much reviling against us. Some indeed fled, no one pursuing them, and we were expected to thrust ourselves in uncalled, with the desire of praise from them. But when we returned, bringing back with us much sickness by reason of rains and

privations, straightway letters reached us from the East, signifying that there had been brought to Paulinus and his party, certain epistles from the West, as if tokens from some principality,<sup>1</sup> and that the chiefs of his faction thought great things, and glorified themselves with these letters; then that they set forth a creed, and with that were ready to enter into communion with our Church. And in addition this also was announced to us, that they are leading over to their side that every way most excellent man Terentius, to whom I wrote immediately, as forcibly as I was able, holding him back from the plunge, and teaching the deceit that is in them."

On the 17th of November, A. D., 375, about the time the above letter was written, the Emperor Valentinian died in the 55th or 56th year of his age, and the 12th of his reign. He was succeeded in the Empire of the West by his young son, Gratian.

JOHN H. EGAR.

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

## PAUPERISM AND ITS TREATMENT.

I. What is Pauperism? I answer, the condition of the poor, who are dependent upon the alms of those in better circumstances. The poor man may have a life scantily furnished, but he is not a pauper until he has learned to live upon what others provide. Pauperism has many degrees, beginning with those, who by some unexpected misfortune, by sickness, or by the inability to obtain work, cannot gain their daily bread. These may, after a brief struggle, learn to depend upon alms, and cease to make personal effort; the condition of chronic, hopeless poverty is then reached. Finally, there is a class of

<sup>1</sup>ὡσπερ τινὲς ἀρχὴς συνθηματα. We take this to be a sarcasm of St. Basil's directed against the assumptions of Damasus, as there are several such in his subsequent letters.

those who make a business of their beggary ; who, whether fit or unfit to work, prefer alms to labor. Careful study has shown how alarming are the proportions of this social disease in every civilized land. The government census, the records of the great cities, the reports of a multitude of organized charities, combine to tell the tale of a life, led by multitudes, which has ceased to desire or struggle for the better things of self-respecting labor. London, Paris, Berlin, New York, bear a common testimony to the fact, that tens of thousands of men, women and children are a dead weight upon the industry and resources of the rest of the community ; that it is not a temporary helplessness, but lasts through life, and transmits its curse.

II. The causes of Pauperism. Before passing on to the *treatment* of pauperism, it may not be amiss to notice some of its causes. We need not go far to find them. They are the outcome of the conditions of our modern civilization. Our social life in its industries, its competitions, in its successes and failures, manufactures pauperism. There is certainly with increasing civilization more sensitiveness in the body social. In the lower ranks of animal life, when one organ or tissue performs all functions, you may cut and separate, without apparent injury or pain ; but among the higher mammalia, the hurt done to the farthest extremity is felt over the whole body. The man's foot is crushed upon the railroad track, and so sensitive are the centres of life that he dies from the mere shock. We have to pay for the many advances of modern civilization in an extreme social sensitiveness. The commercial unity of the world is such that a shock received by the commerce or industry of one nation is felt among people far removed. The industries of the nations feel painfully a cotton famine or an over production of iron.

In these last few years we have been made to understand by certain stern experiences, that this nation, in common with those of older growth, in spite of apparent prosperity and rapid advance, must meet, and at least try to solve

questions of profoundest social importance. Among these perplexities of the social fabric, is what is known as the Labor Question. It has come to mean that even industry, skilled and patient, may not meet with its reward; that a multitude of toilers may ask for the bread which is their due, and be given the stone of denial. Labor, as has been well observed, is worth the use you can make of it, and no more. Lately we seem to have come to a state of things in which the skilled labor of thousands is worthless, because all demand has ceased. Shocks have been given to business credit, and the capitalist, in his fear, has buried his talent out of sight. Money, in whatever form, the blood, as it were, of business life, has ceased to flow, and there is a dangerous congestion in the heart and brain of industry. Whether it be by over production or through extravagant self-indulgence, even the optimist must confess that the times are out of joint. Perhaps it may be part of that price that has to be paid for social advancement, that there must be an increasing tendency to the disarrangement of supply and demand. New machinery enables one workman to perform the work of three, and until a place is found for the discharged two, there is much privation and suffering. To be out of work is a terrible experience through which a great multitude in this and other lands are now passing. The worker with his numerous brood of children, waits for the work that does not come, until his heart is faint within him, and his spirit grows bitter against the ordering of things as they are. Life seems to him a strange and horrible puzzle, and it is not wonderful that when he hears the doctrine proclaimed that all property is robbery he is ready for any deed of violence. He sees the rich indulging in their plenty, and he and his starving. No wonder that in his blind rage he strikes at that which he believes to be his enemy.

These existing conditions of stagnation in the labor market, and of a bitter sense of injustice on the part of a great multitude, accustomed to toil for their daily bread,



but denied the opportunity to work, have a direct bearing upon the subject before us. The unemployed workingman and his starving brood, desperate in the present and hopeless for the future, are being prepared to leave the ranks of the self-respecting poor, and to descend into the pauper caste; at last ready and willing to remain idle, and to depend upon the dole of public or private charity. I do not say that this unhealthy condition of labor is the only cause of pauperism, but certainly it is a very important factor. Whatever the causes, they unite to create a vast body of the abjectly poor, unused to industry, and hating to be roused to effort; ignorant, dirty and degraded. The pauper propagates his kind, there are those born paupers; from the cradle—if cradle there be—to the grave, leading a half human existence, so unconscious of better things, that there is neither energy nor aspiration in them. It has been a fond expectation in this land, sedulously taught, that in some way, unexplained, we were to escape the painful experiences of the Old World. The dire poverty of the European laborer was not to be known here. This pleasant dream has vanished, and all thoughtful men perceive that we are to face the same social difficulties that Europe knows so well. There are to be here as elsewhere, a class of the very rich and a class of the very poor. Our youthful bloom has faded, and in order to start us well in this matter of pauperism, local authorities in England and Germany, it is said, have shipped us paupers ready made.

Whatever the causes, we are now forced to encounter pauperism in all its forms; the unfortunate workman and his helpless brood, just entered upon the downward course; the abject pauper, vegetating in the poorhouse; and lastly, the incorrigible beggar, who by low cunning and ceaseless shifts, extorts a living from the public. The great cities swarm with these civilized savages; men and women by thousands who have never learned to work, or who, in their degradation, prefer to beg. Their ranks are

being all the time increased by the little ones born and trained amid idleness and squalor, and by the unfortunates who descend from former heights of self-respecting toil. With hungry mouths and idle hands they not only contribute nothing to the life of the community, but menace its welfare. For a mass of chronic, hopeless paupers is full of peril to every interest of human life. Men learn with a fatal facility, to prefer begging and stealing to the slow, small rewards of labor, and out of this pauper multitude come the recruits to fill the army of crime, and to be the ready instruments in deeds of riot and bloodshed. We had thought that in this favored land Enceladus sleeps forever beneath the mountain, but there are already social tremblings which forbode that the Titan forces of ignorance and blind rage may yet upheave society.

III. After this brief reference to some of the more evident causes of this disease of pauperism, the question arises, what shall be the treatment? We cannot adopt the ostrich method, and refuse to see the alarming proportions of chronic and degraded poverty. Self-preservation, if there is no spirit of charity, calls for a remedy. The fever which has its genesis amid famine and filth, may destroy life in a palace. Whitechapel and a Sixth Ward are not only a shame to civilization, but a perpetual danger to society. A great army of paupers, either hopeless or brazen, stands as a perpetual rebuke to our boasted social advance and prosperity. The professional beggar and the tramp cry, "what will you do with us?" We cannot defer the answer, nor can we take a sentimental view of far off woes, as did our English cousins of slavery, some twenty years ago. Pauperism is near, at our very doors. What remedies have we to propose? Suppose that the law, in all its official majesty of blue coat, numbered hat and truncheon, orders the beggar to "move on," the natural question is, *where?* What methods of social drainage can be adopted by which all this mass of corrupted humanity may be made to disappear, so that it shall no longer poison

the health of the community? Or is there some social Gehenna outside the walls of society where this refuse of humankind may be cast and destroyed. Froude, the historian, with ill-concealed approval, cites the statutes of Henry VIII, and of Edward VI, by which sturdy and valiant beggars were subjected to heroic treatment. The tramp, or his representative in the Sixteenth century, was to be punished for the first offence by imprisonment in the stocks; then he was to be whipped and have his ear mutilated; and, finally, as an incurable beggar, to be hung.

But if we hesitate to kill off these uncomfortable members of society, a certain school of philosophers hasten to console us. You need not draw the sword, for by a great law of universal application, nature is all the time ridding itself of what is worthless. The *fit* survive, the *unfit* perish. Herbert Spencer writes; "The poverty of the incapable, the distress that comes upon the imprudent, the starvation of the idle, and the shouldering aside of the weak by the strong, which leave so many in shallows and in miseries, are the decrees of a large, far-seeing benevolence. \* \* \* Under the natural order of things, society is constantly excreting its unhealthy, imbecile, slow, vacillating, faithless members." Unfortunately facts evident to us all, do not sustain this application of the theory of the survival of the fittest. The poorest of the poor multiply with a rapidity far exceeding the average of human increase. Wretched or not, starving or not, they swarm in ever increasing numbers. We shall therefore not be rid of the pauper by any kindly interference of physical law. Nor are the philosophers quite prepared to pass by the misery of the sick and the pauper. They acknowledge the healthfulness of the instinct which prompts us to help the helpless. The solidarity of mankind is a favorite teaching of the day, and surely the pauper is a part of this great unity. It is better to put forth the hand of help, than to permit the slow death of the unfit.

Again, let me ask the question. What is to be done

being all the time increased by the little ones born and trained amid idleness and squalor, and by the unfortunates who descend from former heights of self-respecting toil. With hungry mouths and idle hands they not only contribute nothing to the life of the community, but menace its welfare. For a mass of chronic, hopeless paupers is full of peril to every interest of human life. Men learn with a fatal facility, to prefer begging and stealing to the slow, small rewards of labor, and out of this pauper multitude come the recruits to fill the army of crime, and to be the ready instruments in deeds of riot and bloodshed. We had thought that in this favored land Enceladus sleeps forever beneath the mountain, but there are already social tremblings which forbode that the Titan forces of ignorance and blind rage may yet upheave society.

III. After this brief reference to some of the more evident causes of this disease of pauperism, the question arises, what shall be the treatment? We cannot adopt the ostrich method, and refuse to see the alarming proportions of chronic and degraded poverty. Self-preservation, if there is no spirit of charity, calls for a remedy. The fever which has its genesis amid famine and filth, may destroy life in a palace. Whitechapel and a Sixth Ward are not only a shame to civilization, but a perpetual danger to society. A great army of paupers, either hopeless or brazen, stands as a perpetual rebuke to our boasted social advance and prosperity. The professional beggar and the tramp cry, "what will you do with us?" We cannot defer the answer, nor can we take a sentimental view of far off woes, as did our English cousins of slavery, some twenty years ago. Pauperism is near, at our very doors. What remedies have we to propose? Suppose that the law, in all its official majesty of blue coat, numbered hat and truncheon, orders the beggar to "move on," the natural question is, *where?* What methods of social drainage can be adopted by which all this mass of corrupted humanity may be made to disappear, so that it shall no longer poison

the health of the community? Or is there some social Gehenna outside the walls of society where this refuse of humankind may be cast and destroyed. Froude, the historian, with ill-concealed approval, cites the statutes of Henry VIII, and of Edward VI, by which sturdy and valiant beggars were subjected to heroic treatment. The tramp, or his representative in the Sixteenth century, was to be punished for the first offence by imprisonment in the stocks; then he was to be whipped and have his ear mutilated; and, finally, as an incurable beggar, to be hung.

But if we hesitate to kill off these uncomfortable members of society, a certain school of philosophers hasten to console us. You need not draw the sword, for by a great law of universal application, nature is all the time ridding itself of what is worthless. The *fit* survive, the *unfit* perish. Herbert Spencer writes; "The poverty of the incapable, the distress that comes upon the imprudent, the starvation of the idle, and the shouldering aside of the weak by the strong, which leave so many in shallows and in miseries, are the decrees of a large, far-seeing benevolence. \* \* \* Under the natural order of things, society is constantly excreting its unhealthy, imbecile, slow, vacillating, faithless members." Unfortunately facts evident to us all, do not sustain this application of the theory of the survival of the fittest. The poorest of the poor multiply with a rapidity far exceeding the average of human increase. Wretched or not, starving or not, they swarm in ever increasing numbers. We shall therefore not be rid of the pauper by any kindly interference of physical law. Nor are the philosophers quite prepared to pass by the misery of the sick and the pauper. They acknowledge the healthfulness of the instinct which prompts us to help the helpless. The solidarity of mankind is a favorite teaching of the day, and surely the pauper is a part of this great unity. It is better to put forth the hand of help, than to permit the slow death of the unfit.

Again, let me ask the question. What is to be done



with the pauper? Something must be done. All kindly impulses prompt to action; Christian service commands it. You cannot afford to come to the cold-blooded conclusion that by some mysterious law of averages, so many in each community must be paupers. Neither the good citizen, nor the Christian man can content himself with an easy acknowledgment that as things are, pauperism has to be, and that no human power can interpose in the presence of a curse which robs a multitude of human lives of all that makes life worth the having. But in going forth to help, have clearly in mind what is the object of the help to be rendered. It is not to be a momentary relief, not a day's food or a night's lodging offered to some wretched outcast; the design is to *cure* the poor of their poverty. There is yet a nobler object, namely to overcome those conditions which are all the time tempting and degrading the poor man, so that he becomes a pauper. How shall the multitude of the poor, under the strain and fret of poverty, be prevented from dropping into the abyss of pauperism, or is there any rescue?

I answer that although the poor we shall have with us always, and no provision can compel a uniformity of earthly conditions, it is a lasting disgrace to any civilization that it is content to let the pauper abide and multiply in his pauperism.

IV. But in extending the hand of help, let it never be forgotten that indiscriminate aid is worse than useless. Such aid often proceeds from kindly motives, but it may be a mere impulse of selfishness. The beggar wearies us with his pertinacity, and we dismiss him with a trifle, glad to be rid of him. With some variation in his tale of woe, he passes on to receive like treatment. In some of the lives of the saints we have the record of a miraculous insight, by which impostors were brought to confusion, but modern saints, even rectors, have no supernatural aids afforded them. And it is such a temptation to a busy parson to pay a trifle on demand to forward a rather ragged and dirty

member of the Church of England on his way to the nearest clerical brother. Even if the beggar be not an impostor, you may, by indolent and unwatched gifts, be teaching him the dreadful lesson of depending upon alms; the aid you give may benumb and finally paralyze his manhood. Suffering is bad, and the kindly prompting is in itself not evil, but woe be unto us if we follow not our alms with other ministrations. Abundant experience proves that lasting injury is done by hasty and careless help. There is a subtle poison in unearned money.<sup>1</sup> The cunning of the professional beggar will always get the better of the heedless, inconstant aid of the alms-giver. The army of tramps, officered and moving from place to place with mutual understanding, will, of course, win the victory over undisciplined benevolence. It is therefore, an axiom in the treatment of pauperism, that the work is to be through organization and with system. Otherwise the deserving poor are passed by, and the importunate beggar fattens upon the alms of the charitable.

V. There are four agents or agencies, each of which may take part in the treatment of this disease of pauperism. They are the State (under which head come all forms of civil administration); the Individual; the Charitable Society; and the Church. These agents need not be altogether separated in their working. The State and the Secular Association can be influenced by that divine enthusiasm which dwells in the Church; the Church may be aided in its ministration by the power of that which is secular.

(a). The State. Wise men differ as to how much of administrative function is to be committed to the State, and there is a deep suspicion in this land of what is sometimes known as paternal government, that is, the constant interference of the powers that be, in business and social

---

<sup>1</sup>Defoe, the Author of Robinson Crusoe, wrote a remarkable tract, entitled "Giving Alms no Charity."

life. Whatever the theories, our common sense makes us look to the State for some action in regard to the treatment of pauperism. All approve of the State charities for the orphan and the diseased in body, or mind. These weak members of society are to be protected in their helplessness. Also some public provision for the poor is expected. Every civilized land has legislated again and again upon the matter. At this present time, in our own State, New York, fresh legislation is being proposed, and there is a desire to use all the experience gained by many painful blunders in the past. The problem is exceedingly difficult, and made increasingly difficult by existing social conditions. Much has been accomplished by statute in this and other States, in doing away with abuses in poorhouses, and asylums for insane paupers. But this seems to be the very smallest part of the work to be done. How shall these paupers, young and old, ignorant and vicious, not only be fed and housed and clothed, but lifted up and taught to provide for themselves? How shall the law discriminate between the mendicant, who makes a business of his beggary and the poor man, helpless in his poverty. The State has unfailing material resources, and yet the outcome of all the legislation, and the lavish expenditure has not been very assuring. £15,000,000 are said to be expended annually in England, in providing for the poor; nevertheless, English writers give us appalling pictures of the pauperism, and of the brutality oftentimes of the treatment to which the poor are subjected.

The reluctance, says one writer, of the respectable poor to go to the work-house need be a matter of very little surprise, on account of the intense dread felt by them toward the pauper nurses, and the mixing up of the vilest characters with the more respectable poor. \* \* There are, by day and night, sights and sounds in some of these sick rooms which make them a hell upon earth, and some of the pauper nurses are as wicked and violent as the worst of the patients. \* \* The assortment of strange bed-fellows in a work-house ward is such as poverty and the poor-law could alone bring together; men in convict-looking clothing are sitting on the sides of the beds; faces are amongst them on which one dare not look again. Strong, bad men are

dying here, after lives of sin and shame, wild animals tracked to their lair, dying savages to the last. Children are here. \* \* \* A workhouse is a place where we find childhood without its joys, youth without its hope, age without its honor; a place the sight of which more than anything else, tries our faith in the ultimate triumph of good over evil.

Perhaps conditions of like horror are to be found in this land. The last report on "State Pauperism" in this our proud Empire State, presents a condition of things in some of the poorhouses painful and repulsive beyond description. There are sore and great dangers in civil management. Resources have been squandered, the work undertaken has been done in an unfaithful way, and is only superficial in its intent. It is mechanical in its methods, and unloving in its administration. Bumble, the beadle, greedy and heartless, comes to be the representative of the State in caring for its helpless children, and after abundant legislation and the voting of endless supplies, the old question arises, *Quis custodiat custodes?* Nor is relief to be obtained by taking the young and educating them to better things in asylums and schools. It would be impossible, in the very nature of the case, thus to provide for all pauper children, nor has the result of this training been altogether satisfactory. It may be well to remember that a building comfortably heated and ventilated, good food, warm clothing, and the rudiments of education are not after all substitutes for that divine and precious thing—a *home*. Governmental aid cannot provide the family with its silent influence upon the character. Is it too much to hope that in some coming day of better civilization the State will learn to care for the poor with an intelligent comprehension of its task?

(b). There are other agencies which have been mentioned in this paper. To supplement the evident defects of civil aid, there are benevolent men and women in every community who on charitable thought intent, and full of sympathy, go forth to help the poor. They are not content to pass by the wretchedness and squalor of the tenement house, but would enter its dismal rooms and minister to its

degraded inmates. Perhaps their feeling may be that expressed by Greenwood, the Amateur Casual:

I have been asked many times since, on a memorable occasion, I volunteered into the ranks of pauperism and assumed its regimentals, what was the one foremost thought or anxiety that beset me as I lay in that den of horrors. \* \* \* This was it: "What if it were true? What if, instead of your every sense revolting from the unaccustomed dreadfulness you have brought it into contact with, it were your lot to grow used to and endure it all, until merciful death delivered you? What if these squalid, unsightly rags—the story of your being some poor devil of an engraver who really could not help being desperately hard up and shabby—were real?

By such thoughts the feeble pulse of human benevolence is made to beat with fuller tide. But the individual, however zealous, soon discovers his limitations. He cannot sufficiently guard himself from imposture, and at the best, in view of the vast dimensions of pauperism, his work is so petty as to be all but resultless. He may stand faithfully at his post and cry for help, as did the little boy at the Holland dike, holding his feeble hand in the crevice to keep out the inflowing sea, steadfast through all the chill hours of the night—but able only to cry for help.

(c). Hence thoughtful and benevolent people organize in associations for the administration of charity; in building and supporting hospitals, orphan houses and widows' homes. Rich men sometimes, during life, or at death, provide funds whose income may be devoted to the needs of a neighborhood. At the best such provisions go a very little way in view of the great proportions of the evil designed to be reached; and they have this danger in them, that in undertaking to help the poor they may increase pauperism. A better direction of systematic help is found in those corporations whose object is to teach the poor to help themselves. Among these may be named, what in England are known as Friendly Societies, in our country Savings banks; and all enterprises, great or small, co-operative stores, labor schools—anything which may dispel ignorance and teach the poor in days of comparative prosperity, to lay by for the future. These agencies, however, are more in the way



of *prevention* than of cure. Much good may be done by secular associations in examining the haunts of the pauper, in penetrating the cheats of the impostor, in extending help when help is needed, in leading some out of their degradation.

(*d*). If human and temporary associations can do much, what shall be the office and ministry of that divine and perpetual association, the Church of Christ? It needs no argument in this REVIEW to prove how pre-eminently it is the office of the Church to visit the poor, and to make that visitation a ministry to the spirit as well as the body. It must be confessed that occasion has been given for the charge made by some modern writers that the Church in the Middle Ages fostered mendicancy, and thereby increased pauperism. Nevertheless it was better to put forth some hand of help and to make some gesture of charity than to let the miserable perish in their misery. But with the experience gained in all these centuries, how shall the Church be true to its duty, and minister to the poor? So scattered and wasted are Christian forces by the endless separations of those who call themselves Christians, that it would seem impossible to do much in reaching and curing the disease of pauperism. The State is strong in material resources; the Church is needy—all but a mendicant in this land, seemingly able to keep alive only the ministry of worship, and forced to renounce, but in feeblest exercise, the ministry of alms-giving.

Confessing the material weakness of the Church, yet be it ever remembered that the Church has what the State does not claim to have. The State may help the poor and strive to solve the problem of pauperism from merely prudential considerations; the Church *must* work among the poor because they are Christ's poor, and the love of Christ constrains. The Church is Christ's body, bound by every vital bond to Him. He is the Sun of Righteousness to this earth, the centre and giver of all moral force. Our charities should be waves of love, whose impulse comes from Christ, who loved us and gave Himself for us. But again the cry comes

what can the Church do, distracted and divided as it is? I answer, while we pray for unity there is in the present a work to do. Not all the work that might be done, yet a blessed and resultful ministry for Christ's dear sake. Even that much abused entity, the parish, can be a convenient agent in the administration of charity; and in the larger cities the united action of all the parishes may reach results now undreamed of. I plead for organized Christian help. Much that may be suggested is doubtless far off in its accomplishment, but Christian enthusiasm and patient devotion must have their reward. The problem of how to treat pauperism is in every aspect a most perplexing one, but it is a characteristic of the heavenly charity that it never fails. The charitable work of a congregation or of an association of congregations has scarcely begun when the necessities of a few poor communicants have been relieved. Nor is it an extremely trying duty for well-intentioned young ladies, with abundant leisure, to carry baskets of dainties to aged pensioners. A sentimental kindliness is the easiest of things; a practical system of help the most difficult. If the Church had a hundred-fold the gifts to bestow upon the poor the result might be only disastrous. The end sought is not to support upon alms a vast number of idle and ignorant beneficiaries, but, while affording temporary aid, to instruct the ignorant, to awaken dead ambitions, and to restore vanished self-respect; to help the poor to help themselves.

Hence the parish school, if a congregation can provide one, has a work not merely in training church-ward a number of the young, but in bringing up poor children to a right way of thinking and in habits of self-dependence.

In considering the duties of the State I made no reference to education. The common school system is no doubt a valuable agent in the treatment of pauperism, but there are startling revelations of its impotence in teaching *righteousness*. The educated tramp may be the more accomplished beggar and villain. If, as the drift of the times indicates,

the common school is to be wholly secular, and is to leave the education of the moral sense unattempted, then let the Church write upon this *tabula rasa* the fear of God, which is the beginning of wisdom; and in place of the modern gospel of mutual advantage, let the loveliness of Christian service be taught. The *humanities* cannot afford to do without the *divinities*. The Sunday school can contribute to this important part of the work. Mission chapels and schools, with their sewing classes and mother's meetings and other useful machinery, can do much in removing the helplessness and squalor of poverty.

Perhaps one form of help, as yet almost untried, may be found in what can be termed a Parish Mutual Fund. All rectors know how small and soon exhausted is the communion offering. Shall not the Church learn from the world in this matter? Why should not all the members of a congregation unite; each worshipper, great and small, paying a pledged amount, so much per week or month, toward a mutual relief fund. Let the rich as well as the poor, in one bond of brotherhood, pay into this fund. Few may ever need to draw upon it, but those who, in poverty or old age, have a claim upon this church-poor-fund, need have no hurt done to their self-respect.

But, as all painfully know, a vast majority of the poor, and especially of the pauper class, is unreached by these methods. Christian enthusiasm and patient love will have to go forth seeking the poor and outcast. There is need of personal contact with the degraded and the hopeless to carry brotherliness in our ministrations. None of the conditions which are creating pauperism can be ignored. Let the supreme difficulty of the enterprise be fully understood. We may help and help endlessly; we may warm and clothe the poor man and his household, but if our alms teach him to despise work and to depend upon us, we have murdered his manhood. In making a pauper we have killed a man. There is needed not an alms-dropping of languid church-goers, but a ministry of loving and devoted

members of Christ. While the Christian offers the cup of cold water in the name of a disciple, let him impart also of himself. Sympathy and practical counsel are sorely needed by the pauper, though they may be perversely rejected. Soup tickets and doles of provisions are useless, unless there be a visitation from house to house. Know whom you are helping. Thus you learn the story of sad and tempted lives; you can estimate and study how to diminish the ill-effects of ignorance, of crowded tenement living, of drunkenness, and of impure and sensational reading. Much ingratitude will appear, and stubborn opposition on the part of those you would help. There is a triple wall of ignorance, apathy and suspicion to be surmounted before you really reach the pauper. Any method of prevention of this great evil of pauperism, above all of cure, must needs be exceedingly slow, but the Christian is not to grow weary in well-doing. He is to use all the experience which worldly wisdom has to offer, and give the life of Christian enthusiasm and love to his work. A patient, minute treatment is the only one which promises results worthy to endure. It is the wisdom and duty of the State to institute and sustain economic reforms, which may give the pauper better houses to live in, and even work to do, and to instruct in such humble skill about household matters that the squalor of the tenement house may vanish, and the comfort of a home take its place. But the civil authority cannot, with its cumbrous machinery and unloving administration, do the nobler work of *saving* the pauper; the Church has often failed even to attempt it. Perhaps the Church has wasted its strength in trifles; perhaps it has seemed in this land a battle for mere existence, but never can the body of Christ be so severed from its head as to fail to go forth with ministrations of help, seeking to heal human infirmities.

Organization is needed as well as personal enthusiasm. Let the worker, as he goes forth to his work of charity, feel that he stands not alone; let there be some association, with its responsibility and sustaining power. Here is a large

field of work in which the zeal of church guilds and parish associations may be well expended. We can afford to do without certain indulgences in our houses of worship, and with the fruit of self-denial go forth to save the pauper from his living death. Do not alarm and repel the pauper and his household by tracts and small doses of good advice—those things have their place—but the time is not yet. Carry sympathy with your gifts, study with the minute patience that love sustains, and the insight which love grants, the needs of these wretched ones. Your task is full of perplexities at every step; you may be tempted to say, after years of effort, that the enterprise is too large for the ability of the few Christians engaged in it. But be mindful that this slow and painful work, this work so small as to be all but invisible amid the vastness of pauperism, is the only work that endures. If every community could unite its forces of charity under the banner of Christ, working with gathered power and personal love, how real and lasting would be the benefit!

We need not Bumble, the beadle, clothed in a little brief authority, harsh and unfaithful; but Dorcas, with her sanctified womanhood, and Luke, the beloved physician, his skill more helpful because Christ is in him, and all that noble line of men and women beginning with Him who was a servant of many, and of Whom it is recorded that "He went about doing good."

F. D. HOSKINS.



## EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

We hear it constantly said as a matter for congratulation, that party lines no longer exist in the Church in this country; that on the one side the "Low Church" element has almost disappeared as a party, and that on the other, "Old-fashioned High Churchmen" are very scarce, as a friend said in a letter lately received, "*rari nantes in gurgite vasto*." And to a certain extent this may be true. The old party lines are no longer drawn so clearly and tightly as formerly. Great changes have taken place in men's attitude towards each other. Thank God, a wider spirit of charity prevails; there is also more independence, it cannot be known beforehand from party associations how men will vote on any given question. The last two General Conventions have very strikingly shown this change.

But yet, none the less, there are different schools of thought, if we may not call them parties, in the Church, and they follow very much the old divisions. Such always have existed, and from the nature of the human mind it may be expected that they always will exist. The gain is, not that these are extinct, that would be a loss, but that they are animated by a better spirit, that they are less partisan. Without pretending to give a full account of these various schools of thought, we wish to say a few words about some of them, and if in so doing, we use the common titles to designate them, we do it, not because we think they always apply, but for convenience.

There are still to be found among us, the old-fashioned Low Churchmen and High Churchmen. We shall speak of these together. They are a quiet, steady set, more numerous than is generally supposed; doing after their fashion, with little fuss or display, a large share of the work of the Church. Differing though they do, they keep things steady. They are in doctrine and discipline, the conservative element. They do not take the

lead as they once did, they do not, as formerly, fight each other; they sometimes join hands to oppose extreme tendencies in others. They are the centripetal power, without them the others would fly off at tangents. Recruits are drawn from their ranks on the one side to the "Broad," on the other to the "Ritualistic school," not always in the direction we might expect. The change for the better in these is, that the "Low" are not so bitter in denouncing, as wanting in "vital piety," all who do not believe as they do, while their standard of churchmanship has been raised; the "High" have gained in breadth of views, can see that rigid uniformity need not and cannot be maintained; their churchmanship is not less strong, but it is less sectarian than it was. These two sustain the old doctrinal and disciplinary standards of the Church. Their danger and fault is of being so conservative as to be obstructive. So fearful of change as to prevent alterations for the better demanded by the position and growth in the Church in the statement of doctrine and in ritual observance, as well as in discipline.

We cannot pretend to give a definition of "Broad Churchmanship," we doubt if it can be done. We think that it may fairly be said that its leading spirit is that of investigation, of taking nothing for granted, and also of eclecticism. It would, perhaps accept as a motto the Apostolic injunction, "prove all things; hold fast that which is good." But then under this wide definition, there is room for such an infinite variety of opinions, that it would be impossible here to define them all, even if we were able to do it. There are some of whom it may be said, that they are very much abroad. This is manifested by a tendency toward doubting the plenary inspiration of Holy Scriptures, and a dislike for dogmatic teaching. They are disturbed by the apparent conflict between science and theology, and having hastily concluded that theology must be wrong, endeavor so to criticise the Bible as to make it conform to scientific views. Hence, some have been led to doubt the truth of miracles, the efficacy of prayer, the atonement and other leading teachings of the Church. Of course, all this applies only to a portion, a small portion, of those known as Broad Churchmen. Still we must be bold to say that the danger of this school is skepticism. And yet the principle underlying it is a right one, if properly guarded. There need be no danger from any thorough and honest criticism of the Bible. All that

need be asked is fairness; a criticism based on well established facts, not on the conjectures or theories of the critic. We do not fear a conflict between science and religion; nor that the discoveries of science will invalidate the Bible. All we ask is that the scientist shall be sure of his alleged facts. It is not the thoroughly trained and earnest seekers after the truths of nature the Church need fear, such men are always humble. In this emphatically it is "a little learning is a dangerous thing." It is a great mistake for the Christian to endeavor to stop investigation, to endeavor to cover up the dogmas of his religion and say you must not question or look into them. Our Lord courted investigation of His claims. There can be no contradiction between the works and the words of God.

This school is in some degree, in doctrine the result of a reaction from the old Calvinistic teachings. In churchmanship, while not holding implicitly to the Divine authority of the Church, it may be said that its practice is better than its theory. We have already pointed out what we believe to be the danger of this school; its advantage is in widening the mind of the Church, keeping up relations with those who differ from us, and so removing prejudices and especially in cultivating the intellectual element among us.

As regards what is improperly called "Ritualism," though we do not at all like much that is done under this name, still we gratefully acknowledge the good that has been accomplished. The Ritualists have been the means of bringing about a fuller recognition of the Divine mission of the Church of Christ; and, also a greater respect for the sacraments, and have promoted a more earnest and reverent performance of public worship. Let them have full credit for this. Much of the work they have done was needed, it is good work up to a certain point. Their mistake is in the direction of unduly dwelling upon the importance of the externals of religion, of mistaking means for ends. Their danger is, that they may be led into using Ritual as a vehicle for teaching doctrines which this Church has not received. Unconsciously they have fallen into the error of Puritanism; the assumption that they are infallibly right, and the inordinate exercise of the right of private judgment. They, sometimes, in what is an offensive way, arrogate the title of "Catholic," as though to them exclusively

it belongs; and they claim it because they advocate certain dogmas such as "Eucharistic Adoration," and certain practices, as "Auricular Confession," intoning the service, peculiar vestments, etc. Now we take it, that a belief in the creeds of the Universal Church and communion in her faith, constitutes Catholicity. What right has a small section of the Church to claim exclusively for itself this name of Catholic? And then who is to be the judge, if such a usage be Catholic? Why, themselves. Let these men bear in mind that their vows of allegiance are to this Church in these United States, not to some vague dream of Catholicity, such as they in their private opinion think it is or ought to have been. Another mistake we see in the Ritualists, or some of them, is in the vague use of terms that are apt to be misunderstood. They forget the prejudice that is excited in this way against the Church. For instance, take the phrases already mentioned of "Eucharistic Adoration" and "Auricular Confession." To the public mind, these convey an idea that the Ritualist will undoubtedly repudiate, of worshiping the Eucharist and of compulsory, habitual confession. Would it not then be better not to use them? Especially since the Church of England and America does not employ them, and they are so liable to abuse, and to do harm? If Eucharistic Adoration mean no more than this definition which we quote from a leading organ of this school, given in answer to a challenge to speak out its meaning, the phrase is not worth contending for:

We adore in the Blessed Sacrament our Lord, Really Present in His Own appointed way, in His Own appointed Feast.

This definition might be subscribed to by a Zuinglian, it really defines nothing.

So also, if "Auricular Confession" mean nothing more than is taught in the notice of the celebration for the Holy Communion, it is not worth while to cause contention by its use. Such terms mean either too much or too little to be safely employed. We earnestly urge these brethren to consider whether it be worth while to insist upon the use of terms offensive to a large proportion of their fellow-churchmen, prejudicial to the growth of the Church, and which after all, are not really Catholic. We have spoken thus plainly, because we are grieved that the good which this school has undoubtedly accomplished, and is capable of carry-

ing out, should be hindered by these defects; and also because we fear that the constant use of phrases and acts liable to erroneous interpretation, may lead some minds into those errors of doctrine, which, by them another branch of the Church undoubtedly teaches.

Two things are encouraging for the future of the Church. One, the obliteration of party lines, the subsidence in a remarkable degree of bitterness and strife, the willingness to allow differences of opinion; the other, the spirit of activity shown on all sides in works of charity. When we see thus growing side by side zeal and charity, we may well thank God, and take courage.

With the next number of the REVIEW, will begin a series of *conferences* on topics of present interest. They will be short articles on a given subject, by clergymen and laymen of various shades of opinion. The object being to give information and help churchmen to form correct opinions on questions that are coming before them for solution. The first subject discussed will be: "How we can best promote Church Unity." Among the writers will be Bishop Coxe, Dr. J. Cotton Smith and Dr. Tatlock. We propose to discuss in this way "The Parochial System," "The Ritual Law of the American Church," and such practical topics.

ERRATA. In the "List of Ordinations for 1878," under Northern New Jersey, there is a curious transposition. Mr. Chapman was ordained by the Bishop of Springfield, and Mr. Richmond by the Bishop of Maryland. Also Mr. A. H. Vinton, 2d, ordained by the Bishop of Rhode Island, ought to have been credited to the same diocese. Our readers will please correct their copies.

---

#### AT HOME.

Nothing of very special interest has happened since our last issue. From all sides we hear cheering accounts of the quiet work going on in the Church. The most serious trouble is the difficulty of raising the money needed for Parochial and Mission work. The clergy are the chief sufferers from this. It is no more than fair that they should bear their share in the general



cutting down of incomes, but it is hard that often so much more than their proportion should come upon them.

The "Board of Managers" for Missions have taken another step toward reducing the expenses of the central management of missionary work and simplifying its machinery, by abolishing the special committee for Indian Missions. So that general missionary work in the United States, viz: Domestic Missions, Missions among Colored People and Indians, heretofore carried on by three departments, is now all under the charge of the "Domestic Committee." The result of this "entire unification" of the work, is a great reduction in expenses. In the "Spirit of Missions" for February, 1879, we find a schedule of appropriations for "Domestic Missions" for this year, from which we condense the following items: "For Missions among White People, including salaries and traveling expenses of nine Bishops, \$81,250." "Missions among Colored People, \$12,000." "Missions among Indians, including salary and traveling expenses of Bishop, \$36,930." "Central expenses (salaries, \$4,400, rent, etc., \$3,100), \$7,500." "Making the work known to the Church (Periodicals, etc.), \$2,500." Total, \$140,180. Add to this a debt of \$15,000 for Indian Work, an entire total of *One Hundred and Fifty Five Thousand Dollars*, will be needed to carry on all the work of the Domestic Committee through the year 1879, and leave them free of debt on the 1st of January, 1880.

The great reduction in the estimated expenses of the Central Management caused by the unification of the work, is the feature to which we call special attention. One Secretary, at a salary of \$3,000, with an Assistant Secretary paid \$600, and an Assistant Treasurer, paid \$800, total, \$4,400, are to do all the work heretofore done by seven persons, at an expense for salaries alone, as we gather from the Proceedings of the Board of Missions for 1877, of \$12,167.85, a saving of nearly \$8,000, in this one item. Add to this the savings in office rent, traveling expenses and printing, which we have no data for correctly estimating, but which amounted to several thousand dollars; and it will be seen that a very material reduction has been made in the expenses. Whether the present official staff will be able to do all the work, remains to be proved, it will depend very much on the aid received from the parochial clergy. In *theory* they are the Church's Missionary Agents; in *practice* they have not always carried out this theory. The subject demands their careful consideration, as to their duty in this matter.

We notice a change in the manner of making appropriations:

The Board makes Appropriations in gross to the several Dioceses and Missionary Jurisdictions, notifying the several Bishops of the gross sums so appropriated; and the Bishops regulate the number of Missionary Stations, appoint the Missionaries and assign to them their Stipends, with the approval of the Board.

We like this change, it is more churchly. Now let the Church come up liberally to sustain its missionary work.

At a special Council of the Church in the diocese of Louisiana, held in St. Paul's Church, New Orleans, on the seventh ballot the Rt. Rev. J. H. D. Wingfield, Missionary Bishop of Northern California, was elected to the bishopric, left vacant by the death of Bishop Wilmer.

John Henry Ducachet Wingfield, D. D., LL.D., was born in Portsmouth, Va., September 24, 1833, graduated from William and Mary College, in 1853; studied for a time in "The Theological Seminary of Virginia," at Alexandria; removed to Arkansas, and was ordered Deacon, January 17, 1858, by Bishop Freeman. He was ordained Priest by Bishop Johns, at Alexandria, July 1, 1859; was assistant to his father, the Rev. John H. Wingfield, D. D., Rector of Trinity Church, Portsmouth, Va., and afterwards Rector of St. Paul's, Petersburg, Va. In 1874 he accepted the Rectorship of Trinity Church, San Francisco, Cal., and in the fall of the same year was elected Missionary Bishop of Northern California, by the General Convention, assembled in New York. He was consecrated Bishop in St. Paul's Petersburg, Va., December 2, 1874.<sup>1</sup>

The consent of a General Convention, or of a majority of the Bishops and Standing Committees is required in this case, the same as in that of a Presbyter elected to a Bishopric (See Title I. Canon 15, § ix.)

#### CANADA.

The Very Rev. Wm. Bennett Bond, of whom we gave a notice in our last number, was consecrated as Bishop of the Diocese of Montreal, in St. George's Church, Montreal, on Sunday, January 25, 1879. The ceremony of installation took place the same afternoon in the Cathedral.

On Tuesday, the 28, the House of Bishops unanimously elected as Metropolitan, the Bishop of Fredericton, the Rt. Rev. John Medley, D. D.

#### ABROAD.

We think we can see indications of a better feeling on the subject of ritual in England. The Bishops seem disposed to take the matter up and to interpose their authority to put a stop to unnecessary litigation. And, indeed, putting aside all other reasons, this seems to be the only sensible course to pursue, until

---

<sup>1</sup> We are indebted for these details to Dr. Batterson's "American Episcopate."

the various courts of law have settled the question of jurisdiction. The English people do not take kindly to Ecclesiastical prosecutions. The Guardian tells us that :

"During the past year, eight presentments have been made under the Public Worship Regulation Act, and that out of all these, permission to the complainants to proceed, has been given in one case only. In all other cases the Bishop has intervened, either by declining to take action, or by admonitions, in some cases affecting their purpose, in others, remaining as yet ineffective. It also appears that since the Act came into force in July, 1875, seventeen cases have been taken up by the "Church Association." Of these, one—the Ridsdale case—was carried through; six, including the Hatcham case, failed through various irregularities or technical objections; one was stopped by the death of the Bishop; one is still before the courts; and eight were vetoed by the Bishop or Archbishop."

The conclusion is that "ritual prosecution is not very hopeful work." We are glad of it. The money wasted on lawyers and courts might be better employed. We are also glad that the Bishops are beginning to assume the responsibility in this matter; for after all the remedy for the evil complained of, rests both in England and this country with them; "with their moral influence and the sacred authority of their office."

In this connection, however, two cases have recently occurred, which show that the English Bishops have not an easy task when they, under the present state of the Ecclesiastical laws, attempt to settle differences. The first of these is what is known as "The Lichfield Ritual Cases." The late Bishop of Lichfield, Bishop Selwyn, endeavored to settle the ritual disputes in two of his parishes, by "an arrangement," on the principle of a compromise; suggesting that at certain of the services the complained of ritual should be omitted, and at others, allowed, so that each party might have a service to suit its own ideas. Mr. Bodington, the Vicar of St. Andrew's Wolverhampton, agreed to this, so far as to promise to celebrate the Holy Communion on one Sunday in each month, without the usages objected to, but continuing them at all other times. The present Bishop (Maclagan), approves of this compromise, and orders that it may be so arranged. But the complainants demur, and the Church wardens write a long letter to the Bishop, in which they take the ground, that the acts complained of are either legal or illegal, if legal, the Bishop has no right to forbid them at any service; if illegal, he has no right to allow them at any service. And, moreover, that the will of the Bishop is not the law, he must decide according to the statutes. Rather hard on the Bishops when the chief legal authorities cannot agree as to the meaning of the statutes.

The other case we refer to is a curious one. Dr. Frederick C. Julius, M. D., a member of the Church of England, sojourning in Egypt, but residing for a portion of each year within the bounda-

ries of the parish of Clewer, addressed last July, a letter to the Bishop of Oxford, complaining of "illegal and irregular modes of conducting divine service on the part of the Rector," the well-known T. T. Carter, specifying what these were, offering to prove them, and applying for a commission of inquiry, or for letters of request to the Court of Arches, under the "Act for the better enforcing Church Discipline;" 3d and 4th Vic. 1840. The Bishop of Oxford (Mackarness), in reply endeavored to stave off a trial, by urging the unsettled state of the law, and the proceedings now pending regarding the jurisdiction of the Court of Arches, and of the Privy Council and of the Queen's Bench, and refused to take any steps in the matter. Whereupon Dr. A. J. Stephens Q. C., on behalf of the complainant, makes application, January 23, 1879, before the Chief Justice and Baron Pollock sitting in the Queen's Bench division, for a rule for a mandamus to compel the Bishop of Oxford to take the desired proceedings under the aforesaid Act, against the Rev. Canon Carter.

There are two points involved. The first is whether since the passing of the "Public Worship Regulation Act" in 1874, an "aggrieved parishioner" can give the go-by to this later Act, and proceed under the older one of 1840? The Act of 1874 did not repeal the other, for, relating only to ritual, it leaves entirely untouched the previous manner of proceedings in questions of morals or doctrines; it does not even repeal the previous Act in cases of ritual, all it says about this, is:

Proceedings under this Act shall not be deemed to be such proceedings as are mentioned in the Act of the 3d and 4th year of the reign of her Majesty.

Under this Act the Bishop has discretion to stop all proceedings. The argument of Mr. Stephen was, that it was at the option of the complainant to proceed under the one Act or under the other, and that under the Act of 1840, the Bishop has no choice, but must proceed.

This brings up the second point. Granting that the Act of 1840 is in force, does it allow no discretion on the part of the Bishop, but is he compelled to issue a commission, or grant letters of request? Dr. Stephens had already given an opinion in 1871, that he must act, and now asks that the Bishop be compelled to show cause, for refusing to act in this case. The point turns on the meaning of the phrase "*it shall be lawful* for the Bishop to issue a Commission," etc., does this mean he must, or he may? The Court granted the rule *nisi*.

It is to be noted that none of these proceedings affect the real questions of ritual at issue. They only show the muddle the English Courts have got into.

The Rev. Dr. Lightfoot, Margaret Professor of Divinity at

Cambridge, has been nominated to the See of Durham. The appointment seems to give general satisfaction.

There appears to be a growing feeling in the Church of England for a General Assembly or Council, to take the place of or supplement the present, well nigh powerless, Convocations. Nearly all the Dioceses now have Synods or Conferences.

We must leave for another time, an account of the effort making to procure Episcopal supervision from the English Church, for the Old Catholics of France. Indeed, the movement is so indefinite that it cannot yet be distinctly set forth.

#### AMONG THE BOOKS.

SERMONS FOR THE TIMES. *By Charles Kingsley.* THE CLAREMONT MANUFACTURING Co., pp. 360, \$1.50.

This is a reprint of Sermons published "several years ago," but the publishers rightly judging that there is at the present time a demand for just such sermons, "have ventured to issue a small edition." It is sufficient to mention Kingsley's name to ensure an interest in the book. We have been very much struck with the sermon on "Sponsorship," and urge its perusal. It is indeed a "Sermon for the Times." We cannot refrain from quoting this passage from the sermon on "Justification by Faith." He has been noting the fact that the Catechism teaches nothing about those abstruse doctrines, which are set forth as opinions in the articles, and asks, Why? He answers:

Because they were honest men and practical men. \* \* \* They had taught the children to say that they were members of Christ, Children of God and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven; and they had taught the children when they said that, to mean what they said; for they had no notion that 'I am,' meant 'I may possibly be'; or that 'I was made' meant 'there is a chance of my being made sometime or other.' So believing really what they taught, they believed also that the children were justified. \* \* \* And therefore, instead of puzzling and fretting the children's minds with any of the controversies which were then going on \* \* \* they taught the children simply about God; who He was and what He had done for them and all mankind; that so they might learn to love Him, and look up to Him in faith, and trust utterly to Him, and so remain justified and right, saved and safe forever.

We wish we could benefit our readers by quoting from the sermon on "Duty and Superstition." All we can say here, is, get the book and read for yourselves. You may not agree with all that is said, but you will be the better for reading it.



THE STUDENT'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. *By Philip Smith, B.A.*  
*With Illustrations.* NEW YORK: HARPER & BROTHERS, 1879.  
 pp. 618.

This volume gives the History of the Christian Church during the first ten centuries. It is, we think, the very best condensed Church history yet published. It is an epitome, and yet is readable. There are useful Chronological Tables, and a full Index. The plan of the work is good. There is a short "Introduction on the Church and its History," and three books with these heads. I. "The Primitive and Persecuted Church." II. "The Church of the Roman Empire." III. "The Decline of the Eastern Church and the Establishment of the Roman Empire." These are subdivided into chapters, teaching the history, literature, constitution, worship, doctrines and heresies of each particular period. Of course, there is no pretence of original research; free use is made, even by literal and long quotations, from other histories, especially those of Schaff and Robertson, which last our author considers "the best complete English Ecclesiastical History in a moderate compass." The Churchman will not be quite satisfied with the account given of the establishment of the Episcopacy, yet on the whole, it is as fair as could be expected in a work of the kind. It is admitted that some form of it existed from Apostolic days, though not perhaps exactly Diocesan Episcopacy as we now have it. The list of the writers of each period is very full, and the history of worship and doctrine accurate. The account of heresies, the most puzzling feature of Church history, is clear. We commend this book to those wishing to obtain a general knowledge of Church history, without having time to study larger works.

ENGLISH MEN OF LETTERS. *Edited by John Morley.* HARPER & BROTHERS; NEW YORK, 1879. 12mo. cloth; 75 cents per volume.

We have received two of this series: SIR WALTER SCOTT, by Richard H. Hutton; and PERCY BYSSHE SHELLEY, by John A. Symonds. Several others have been published. The intention is, not to give full biographies of authors, but rather introductions to their lives, "to tempt readers on to a study of the fuller life." Mr. Hutton gives us an essay on SCOTT's life and writings, his facts being taken from Lockhart's life. It is very well done and we think every one after reading it must feel a desire to peruse "the fuller life."

In the case of SHELLEY, the general plan has not been followed. This is really a biography, for as the author says: "Shelley's life and his poetry are indissolubly connected. He acted what he thought and felt, with a directness rare among his brethren of the

poet's craft." We think the public has gained by Mr. Symond's decision. Few persons have access to the larger biographies of this poet, and few would care to read what our author calls "the overwhelmingly copious and strangely discordant," "materials for his life." In this little volume we have a sufficiently full and, though a partial, yet on the whole, a fair sketch of Shelley's character and writings. His was an unfinished life; a strange and unbalanced character, not without suspicion of insanity. We cannot but feel, that he made himself out, in opinions at least, worse than he really was, and hope that had his life been spared, many of his views would have been greatly modified. He was drowned off the coast of Italy, July 8, 1822, in the 29th year of his age. Messrs. Harpers deserve the thanks of the reading public for enabling it to form an acquaintance with English authors in this cheap, yet beautifully printed series.

HARPER'S HALF-HOUR SERIES. *Stories from Virgil. By the Rev. Alfred J. Church, M. A.* 25 cents.

We have here the story of the *Æneid*, told in language that sounds like a translation from the Latin, though it is not literally so, sufficiently accurate to give the reader a very correct idea of Virgil's great work.

FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY. HARPER & BROTHERS: NEW YORK.

These are reprints in a cheap form (ten to fifteen cents) of valuable English works. Some are popular novels, but others are of higher character. Those sent us are of the latter kind, and are not only interesting, but valuable. "THE IRISH BAR," contains a collection of anecdotes, bon-mots, etc., of celebrated members of the bar and bench of Ireland, and also short biographical sketches. Mr. Grattan Geary's "NARRATIVE OF A JOURNEY FROM BOMBAY TO THE BOSPHORUS," contains an interesting description of the present condition of those countries, over which England has bound herself to keep a watchful eye, if not to establish a protectorate. From his account, the capabilities of the lands are great, but the character of the inhabitants and the want of efficient government render the task of development a very difficult one. There is an interesting account of the origin and condition of the various Christian sects. Those who love descriptions of wild sports will be pleased with "SPORT AND WORK ON THE NEPAUL FRONTIER." Vivid descriptions are given of various hunts, especially of the tiger and wild boar. There is also an interesting account of the manner of raising and preparing indigo, and much general information about the country and the natives. The "Library" is printed on good paper, in clear type; the only objection we have to it is that its size renders it inconvenient for preservation.

**HOMILETICAL AIDS FOR THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.** *A Series of Outlines of Sermons for the Sundays and principal Holydays of the Church Calendar.* By a Clergyman. NEW YORK: T. WHITTAKER, 1879. pp. 393, \$2.00.

These are the outlines of his own discourses, prepared by a clergyman of the Church of England, to aid his overburdened brethren in preparing sermons. There are times when some help is needed by almost every pastor—just as there may be need of a stick or crutch when lameness from rheumatism or accident occurs; and then such a book will be found useful. But as it would not be conducive of strength to use crutches all the time; so, such "Homiletical Aids" should be used sparingly. Indeed, we think they should never be followed entirely; but only used to furnish hints. This one seems to give a very full analysis of each text, and used with discretion may be found useful.

**TRENCH, "ON THE STUDY OF WORDS."** *With an Analysis, Additional Words and Questions for Examination.* By Thomas D. Suplée. NEW YORK: W. J. WIDDLETON, 1878. pp. 395. \$1.25.

These lectures of Dean Trench (now Archbishop), are so well known, that it would be superfluous for us to commend them. But we have often wondered why they have not been used as a text-book in our schools. While we are strong advocates for classical studies, *properly pursued*, we also favor a more thorough study of the English language than is generally enforced in our schools. We are glad therefore to find books of this kind are being prepared for school use, and we hope they will be widely introduced. As the editor says, Trench's book was poorly adapted for use as a text-book. This edition has been expressly prepared for this purpose, by adding to each lecture: 1. A complete analysis of the text. 2. A set of questions intended to be suggestive. 3. A list of additional words, further illustrating the subject treated of in the lecture. The intention is that the student shall write the analysis or exercise on the blackboard and then from it explain *viva voce* the leading ideas. One following out this plan will not only attain a great familiarity with his own tongue, but will also acquire a useful facility in expressing his ideas.

**THE STUDENTS' MYTHOLOGY.** By C. A. White. *New Edition.* NEW YORK: W. J. WIDDLETON, 1878. pp. 315, \$1.25.

This book contains two parts. The first giving the classic mythology; the second, those of Egypt, of the Assyrians and other Easterns, of the Scandinavians and Celts, and of the

Mexicans and Peruvians. The supplement contains brief notices of the authors, etc., mentioned in the book. As the work is intended chiefly for the young, and those who attend female academies, great care has been taken to avoid all that is objectionable in the classic fables. Sufficient is given to enable the student to understand any allusions to Mythology that are met with in ordinary reading. The second part is specially useful, because it contains information not usually found in school books.

BOSTON MONDAY LECTURES. HEREDITY, with *Preludes on Current Events*. By Joseph Cook. BOSTON: HOUGHTON, OSGOOD & COMPANY, 1879.

Mr. Cook is certainly a most prolific writer, or rather speaker. He says many things that are good, and many which seem original, because expressed in a novel and startling way. The object of these lectures on "Heredity" is to show how qualities, good and bad, descend under "seven general laws," from one generation to another; and to urge the responsibility of obedience to those laws if we would have the human race improve and not deteriorate. A curious feature of these lectures is the "Prelude on Current Events," delivered before each; which has nothing to do with the subject which follows; but in which Mr. Cook freely delivers, with wonderful confidence, his opinions on a great variety of topics, such as: The American Indian, American Poetry, Financial Heroes, The Eastern Question, etc. He certainly uses bold, striking language, but considering the great variety of themes discussed, and the remarkable display of learning, we cannot but wonder how one man can find time to read all that he ought to have read, and to write all that he must have written in preparing these Boston Monday Lectures.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE, for March, contains among other interesting papers, the following, to which we call special attention.

Two illustrated papers are devoted to art subjects, without perceptibly diminishing the space given to topics of more general interest. The first of these, entitled "Present Tendencies of American Art," is the beginning of a series of papers on American Art—a sequel to the series given a year ago on "Contemporary Art in Europe" by the same author, Mr. S. G. W. BENJAMIN. The other art paper is devoted to Rembrandt, the first of the "Old Dutch Masters," with four beautifully executed engravings.

ALFRED T. STORY contributes a paper of great popular interest concerning the English home of Washington's ancestors, full of important facts, and containing, among its excellent illustrations,



a picture of the ancestral mansion of the Washingtons in Northants.

"A Few Sea-Birds," by H. W. ELLIOTT, is exceedingly interesting, and beautifully illustrated.

Especially timely and important is Mrs. LAMB's comprehensive and entertaining account of the origin, development and present situation of the United States Coast Survey. With numerous happily selected illustrations, it explains the methods of work pursued by this department, and gives sketches of the four superintendents, with their portraits, and much amusing anecdote.

GEORGE E. WARING contributes the first of his series of papers on the Austrian Tyrol—full of interesting sketches of the country, and magnificently illustrated.

CHARLES BARNARD, in a short illustrated paper, shows the superiority of the American over the English locomotive as a competitor in the markets of the world.

E. M. BACON, contributes an interesting description of the magnetic motor and its inventor, Mr. Wesley Gary, with illustrations.

Beside this variety of interesting articles and pictures, there are the always well-conducted editorial departments, including the timely and graceful gossip of the *Easy Chair*, a comprehensive critical record of recent books, a summary of scientific progress, a *résumé* of current historical events, and an amusing "Drawer."

MESSES. POTT, YOUNG & Co., announce the following as soon to be published. "CHILDREN'S SERMONS," by the Rev. S. Baring Gould. "MANCHESTER SERMONS," by the Rev. W. J. Knox Little. "AUTHORIZED LIFE OF THE LATE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD (Bp. Selwyn), by the Rev. W. H. Tucker, author of "Under His Banner." "STUDIES ON THE COLLECTS OF THE COMMUNION OFFICE, Critical and Devotional," by Edward Meyrick Goulburn, D. D., Dean of Norwich.

CORONATION HYMNS AND SONGS, for Praise and Prayer Meetings, Home and Social Singing. Charles F. Deems, D.D. LL.D., and Theodore E. Perkins, Editors. A. T. BARNES & Co.: NEW YORK, 1879, 35c.

We suppose this book gets its name, because the good old tune Coronation is placed the first. It contains a great many good old psalm tunes, and others which though equally good of their kind, are not, in our opinion, suited for sacred music. It is nicely printed, convenient in form and cheap.



# Harper's Magazine.

1879.

ILLUSTRATED.

## NOTICES OF THE PRESS.

*Harper's Magazine* is the American Magazine alike in literature and in art.—*Boston Traveller*.

The most popular Monthly in the world.—*N. Y. Observer*.

It is an excellent companion for the young, a delight to the mature, a solace for declining age.—*Louisville Courier-Journal*.

No other Monthly in the world can show so brilliant a list of contributors; nor does any furnish its readers with so great a variety and so superior a quality of literature.—*Watchman*, Boston.

The volumes of the *Magazine* begin with the Numbers for June and December of each year. When no time is specified, it will be understood that the subscriber wishes to begin with the current Number.

## HARPER'S PERIODICALS.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE, one year, .	\$4.00	HARPER'S WEEKLY, one year,	\$4.00
HARPER'S BAZAR, " "	4.00	The three publications, one year	10.00
Any two, " "	7.00	Six subscriptions, " "	20.00

Terms for large clubs furnished on application.

Postage Free to all subscribers in the United States or Canada.

A COMPLETE SET of HARPER'S MAGAZINE, now comprising 57 Volumes, in neat cloth binding, will be sent by express, freight at expense of purchaser, for \$2.25 per volume. *Single Volumes*, by mail, postpaid, \$3.00. Cloth cases, for binding, 38 cents, by mail, postpaid.

Remittances should be made by Post-Office Money Order or Draft, to avoid chance of lost.

# Harper's Weekly.

1879.

ILLUSTRATED.

## NOTICES OF THE PRESS.

The *Weekly* remains easily at the head of illustrated papers by its fine literary quality, the beauty of its type and woodcuts.—*Springfield Republican*.

Its pictorial attractions are superb, and embrace every variety of subject and of artistic treatment.—*Zion's Herald*, Boston.

The *Weekly* is a potent agency for the dissemination of correct political principles, and a powerful opponent of shams, frauds and false pretenses.—*Evening Express*, Rochester.

The Volumes of the *Weekly* begin with the first Number for January of each year. When no time is mentioned, it will be understood that the subscriber wishes to commence with the Number next after the receipt of his order.

Terms for large clubs furnished on application. Postage free to all subscribers in the United States or Canada.

The Annual Volumes of HARPER'S WEEKLY, in neat cloth binding, will be sent by express, free of expense (provided the freight does not exceed one dollar per volume), for \$7 each. A complete set, comprising Twenty-two Volumes, sent on receipt of cash at the rate of \$5.25 per volume, freight at expense of purchaser.

Cloth Cases for each volume, suitable for binding, will be sent by mail, postpaid, on receipt of \$1.00 each. Remittances should be made by Post-Office Money Order or Draft, to avoid chance of loss.

Newspapers are not to copy these advertisements without the express order of HARPER & BROTHERS.

Address HARPER & BROTHERS, New York.

F. C. HOYT,

(With T. W. RICHARDSON, Agt., MERCHANT TAILOR)

## Clerical Tailor,

No. 100 FULTON STREET, NEW YORK.

MAKES

Clerical Suits, Cassocks and Cassock Vests,  
*\$30 Clerical Suits a Specialty.*

N. B.—Mr. Hoyt refers to Rev. MORGAN DIX, D. D., Trinity Church; Rt. Rev. Geo. F. SEYMOUR, D. D., General Theological Seminary; Rev. E. B. BOGGS, D. D. and many others of the Clergy.



**J. & R. LAMB,**

**CHURCH FURNISHERS,**

*59 Carmine Street, New York.*

MEMORIALS A SPECIALTY: in Sterling Silver, in Embroideries, in Carved Wood Work, in Brass, in Bronze, in Marble and Stone.

A Specialty of Stained Glass Windows for Memorials.

Banners for Church and Sunday School Celebrations.

Memorial Brasses, Richly Engraved, of New Designs.

Eagle Lecterns, in Carved Oak and Walnut, also, Brass and Bronze.

Alms Basons, in Brass, Bronze and Sterling Silver.

Catalogues: Woodwork 10 c., Metal and Stone 10c. Banners and Embroideries 10c

## AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW.

The beginning of a New Year is a good time to subscribe. For this year, articles are in hand or promised by some of our Bishops, and by many of our leading clergy and laymen.

Those in arrears for subscriptions are earnestly requested to pay at once what is due, to the Proprietor, Newark, N. J. The amount may seem small to each, but in the aggregate is large. If a receipt is demanded, stamps should be enclosed.

### RATES OF ADVERTISING.—(One insertion.)

COVER	Outside, 1 Page	\$25.	1-2 Page	\$15.	1-4 Page	\$9.
	Inside, 1	20.	1-2	12 50.	1-4	7.
Inside, 1 Page,		\$15.	1-2 Page,	\$9	1-4 Page,	\$5.
			1-8 Page,	\$5.		

Liberal deduction made for annual insertions.

Address Rev. E. B. BOGGS, D.D., Proprietor, NEWARK, N. J.